The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVIII, No. 3 MARCH, 1948

CONTENTS

The Definability of Mary's Assumption *Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M.* 161

Apostle of the Parisian Workers *John F. McConnell, M.M.* 178

The Ordeal of Father Wall: Part II *Thomas Owen Martin* 201

The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church: Part I . . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 214

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Interruption of the Divine Office 229

How Soon May Embalming Begin? 230

Removing the Maniple for the Sermon 231

Position of the Fingers in Imparting Blessings 231

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States and Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

BOOK REVIEWS

American Essays for the Newman Centennial, *edited by John K. Ryan and Edmond Darvil Benard* 233

Archbishop Stepinac, The Man and His Case, *by Anthony Henry Count O'Brien* 234

Retreat for Priests, *by Ronald Knox* 236

The Heart Aflame, *by Msgr. Hugh F. Blunt* . . . 238

Baltimore Catechism with Development, *by Bishop Edward J. Kelly.* 238

Holy Week in Large and Small Churches, *by Laurence J. O'Connell* 239

A Friendly Easter Thought For Priests

Have you ever thought of an "Apostolate to the Priesthood"?

1. *Missionary Priests*

The American Ecclesiastical Review receives many requests from priests in poor and missionary sections of this country and abroad for free subscriptions. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to honor these requests. You, however, can do a good work by sending us your check to be applied to one or more of these requests. U.S.A., Canada, and Pan-America, $4.50; foreign, $5.00 per year.

2. *Seminarians*

What better way to start a Seminarian on the path of priestly interests and reading than a subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* We offer the special subscription rate of $3.50 per year on Seminarian subscriptions. If you know of a boy studying for the priesthood, why not subscribe for him? The gift would be appreciated.

Write Today:

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE DEFINABILITY OF MARY'S ASSUMPTION

The Apostolic Letter *Deiparae Virginis* (May 1st, 1946) in which our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, addressing the Catholic Episcopate throughout the world, inquires as to the mind of the universal Church in connection with our Blessed Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven, has been jubilantly greeted by most Catholics as a palpable indication that the long expected definition of that doctrine would soon become a reality. They recall that it was this same procedure which Pope Pius IX adopted in 1849 in connection with Mary's Immaculate Conception and which eventually culminated, in 1854, in the solemn definition of the latter prerogative. Pius XII's recent Letter, then, may well be one of the preliminary steps leading to a dogmatic pronouncement on the matter of Mary's Assumption.

What has been the reaction of the Bishops to the Holy Father's letter? As yet the general public has not been officially told, although it is an open secret among theologians here in Rome that the Holy Father has already received a considerable number of answers, all of which are definitely favorable to the proposed solemn pronouncement. Whether the Holy Father will now take any further steps on the matter remains to be seen. But the feeling around here seems to be that he will, and much sooner than some people expect. We sincerely hope that this "feeling" is not altogether unfounded.

From a strictly theological standpoint, however, the matter is not so simple as it would seem at first sight. There are not a few fundamental theological principles which must be safeguarded in any event; principles which, according to some, create no little difficulty against the doctrine under discussion. Not that these difficulties are necessarily insurmountable; but, they insist, insurmountable or not, they must be honestly faced, scientifically scrutinized and satisfactorily solved before we expect the Holy Father to take the decisive and final step.

The reserve, hesitation and even open hostility of some in this connection, while furnishing our theologians with abundant food for serious thought, have actually served the cause of our Blessed Lady by provoking some very thorough and well-documented treatises on the matter. Thus, for example, Dr. J. Ernst's series of articles and brochures opposing the doctrine's definability[1] was the occasion of some very scholarly dissertations by Fathers Gordillo[2], d'Ales[3], Godts[4], Minges[5], Deneffe[6] and others. After a couple of decades, when we had almost forgotten about the German professor and his strictures, the flame of controversy was suddenly revived (although not quite along the same lines as in the case of Dr. Ernst) by the publication of Fr. Martin Jugie's monumental work entitled *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vièrge; Etude historico-doctrinale* (Città del Vaticano, 1944).

It is no exaggeration to say that Fr. Jugie's book was literally a bombshell calculated to shatter virtually every conceivable argument brought forth up to now by Catholic theologians in favor of Mary's resurrection and bodily Assumption into heaven. It is not our intention at the present time to undertake an extensive evaluation of that work, for this would require a rather lengthy paper in itself. However, for the benefit of those who do not have sufficient time to follow Jugie through 726 crowded pages, it may be well to offer here a brief summary of the author's position on the matter.

(A) None of the arguments produced so far in order to establish the fact of Mary's death and resurrection carry any weight. (B) The traditional belief in Mary's death and resurrection is based on the early apocryphal writings. (C) It is more probable that she did not die, since her Immaculate Conception gave her a "strict right" to immortality. (D) Not even the fact of her being taken into heaven with a glorified body (that is, the Assumption proper, abstracting from death and resurrection) can be satisfactorily established by having recourse to the usual texts from Scripture, to Tradition, the sacred Liturgy, the teaching of the Bishops and the common belief of the faithful; none of these arguments, traditional though they may be, can solve the problem satisfactorily. (E) The only road left open is to find an already revealed truth in which the doctrine of Mary's Assumption (not her resurrection!) may be said to be necessarily implied. That revealed truth is none other than her Immaculate Conception (*Op. cit.*, pp. 506-655).

---

[1] J. Ernst, *Die leibliche Himmelfahrt Mariä historisch-dogmatisch nach ihrer Definierbarkeit beleuchtet* (Regensburg, 1921), followed by several articles in *Theol.-prakt. Quartalschrift* of the same and subsequent years.

[2] M. Gordillo, *Boletín de Mariología Asuncionista*, in *Estudios Eclesiásticos,* IV (1925), 91 ff.

[3] A. d'Ales, "L'Assomption, La question dogmatique," in *Études*, *CLXXVI* (1923), 157 ff.

[4] F. X. Godts, *Definibilité dogmatique de l'Assomption corporelle de la Très Sainte Vièrge. Refutation d'une récente brochure allemande* (Esschen, 1924).

[5] P. Minges, *Über die Definierbarkeit der Lehre von der leiblichen Himmelfahrt Mariä*, in *Theol.-prakt. Quartalschrift*, 78 (1925), 546 ff.

[6] A. Deneffe, *Gehört die Himmelfahrt Mariä zum Glaubensschatz?* in *Scholastik,* III (1928), 190-218.

From the preceding description the reader may easily gather that Fr. Jugie's book was bound to produce a violent shock in the world of theology. The controversy which followed, and which has far from subsided, entangled such scholars as Dr. Charles Balić, Rector of the Pontifical Franciscan University here in Rome, and Prof. Otto Faller, of the Gregorian University.[7] The former, particularly, has subjected the unfortunate book to a merciless and acrimonious counter-attack.

To add fresh fuel to the fire, Dr. J. Coppens, the well-known professor of Sacred Scripture at the Catholic University of Louvain, has recently sounded another note of warning from the pages of the *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* (XXIII [1947], 5-35). The article abounds in reservations, restrictions, hesitations, doubts, ifs and buts, leaving the reader in a labyrinth of confusion. Dr. Coppens goes even further than Fr. Jugie, rehashing stale objections against the definability of our Lady's Assumption in its traditional sense, adding a few of his own, and adopting a decidedly unfavorable stand on the whole matter. The learned professor fears that the doctrine in question is not ripe for a definition on the part of the Church, for the simple reason that it has not been sufficiently established that it forms an integral part of the original deposit of our faith. Particularly, the method by which the revealed character of this doctrine is usually investigated does not, according to him, quite satisfy the demands of scientific *historical* criticism. Hence he asks: Are we not actually harming the Church when we press her to define something which is attested to neither by Scripture nor by early historical records, thereby exposing her to the renewed attacks of her enemies?

---

[7] C. Balić, *De definibilitate Assumptionis B. Virginis Mariae in coelum* (Rome, 1945). O. Faller, *De primorum saeculorum silentio circa Assumptionem B. M. Virginis* (Rome, 1946).

Needless to say, Dr. Coppens' disconcerting paper has made a questionable impression in Rome, and (so we are told) elsewhere also. Just what will be the final outcome of these repercussions, it would be premature to forecast.

Having thus briefly outlined what may be called "the state of the question," a few pertinent observations may be helpful before we proceed to the argumentation proper. And our remarks concern mostly the question of methodology which is of paramount importance. Were we to state the chief deficiency underlying the whole line of reasoning followed by Doctors Ernst, Jugie and Coppens, we would say that it was precisely the inadequate method adopted.

Considering our Blessed Lady's death, resurrection and Assumption as *historical* facts, they seem to overemphasize the necessity of positive, clear, evident *historical* data reaching back to the very first century in order to establish these facts. Baffled at the scantiness of documentary evidence from the first five centuries, to which some add the so-called absolute silence of Sacred Scripture, they express undue concern over the difficulty (if not impossibility) of establishing our doctrine on the solid basis of *positive* theology.

Let us state quite frankly, and with all due respect to these men, that we consider the excessive demands of this method both unnecessary and illegitimate. They are unnecessary because in order to prove the revealed character of a given doctrine it is sufficient that it be clearly taught as such by the *Magisterium ordinarium* of the Church. They are illegitimate because they presuppose that our Lady's Assumption is merely a historical fact, while it is also, if not mainly, a *theological* fact, the existence of which should be decided, not by documentary evidence, but rather by recourse to *theological* principles. Perhaps we should elaborate somewhat on these two aspects of the question.

In order to establish the continuity of a given doctrine throughout the ages it is not necessary that we possess an uninterrupted chain of explicit testimonies linking our times with the apostolic period. The reason for this is quite obvious. Since the custody and infallible interpretation of the deposit of faith has been entrusted by God to a *living* organism which is the Church, and since the Church of today is the same moral person it was in the first or second century, it follows logically that whatever the Church of today holds and teaches as pertaining to the original deposit of revelation was also held and taught (at least implicitly) by the Church of the first centuries. Either we accept this as an incontrovertible principle or we will be confronted with very serious difficulties trying to reconcile the fact that the deposit of revelation was closed at the death of the last Apostle with the fact that the Church has defined as divinely revealed certain truths which were not always explicitly believed, such as the Immaculate Conception, to cite but one example. These things are so elementary in Catholic theology that one often wonders how they could be so easily overlooked even by some of our learned university professors.

We can never lay too much stress on the fact that the living Magisterium of the Church, as exemplified by the Catholic episcopate of today, has exactly the same divine assistance which it had in the very beginning. And it is precisely because of that divine assistance that the body of bishops cannot teach as pertaining to the deposit of faith something which was not in that deposit from the beginning. Hence, since the Catholic episcopate believes our Blessed Lady's Assumption to be of faith, as has been abundantly proved by their petitions to the Holy See,[8] we are authorized to conclude that this doctrine forms an integral part of the original deposit of revelation, even in the absence of this so-called "*historical* evidence."

In the face of these fundamental principles it is rather surprising to see how some have recently tried to minimize the authority of this Magisterium by referring to the lack of precision regarding historical facts, which is evident in some of the episcopal petitions addressed to the Holy See.

This accusation, besides being disrespectful and irreverent towards those whom "the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God" (*Acts*, 20: 28), reveals a deficient knowledge of fundamental theology. The divine assistance was not promised the body of bishops dependently on their competence in the field of history or even theology. Hence the arguments which the

---

[8] Cf. Hentrich-De Moos, S.J., *Petitiones de Assumptione corporea B. V. Mariae in coelum definienda ad Sanctam Sedem delatae* ... (Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1942).

Bishops bring forth in their letters to the Holy Father to corroborate their belief in the Assumption are not necessarily convincing or apodictic. They may be even false, without thereby compromising the doctrine they hold as revealed.

Nor is it theologically correct to suppose, as Dr. Coppens does (*art. cit.*, p. 10), that in order to furnish a conclusive argument the testimony of the bishops must reflect the belief of the faithful. This is all quite remarkable indeed! In fundamental theology we are taught that it is precisely the other way around. The *consensus fidelium* has always been considered a most cogent argument in doctrinal matters *because* it reflects the teaching of the bishops. Let us not forget that the faithful (and that includes the most learned theologians and historians!) belong to the *Ecclesia discens*, while the bishops, and only the bishops, however unlearned, constitute the *Ecclesia docens*. It is to them, therefore, that *all* Catholics must look for guidance in doctrinal matters. They are the official custodians of the deposit of divine revelation. They constitute in our own twentieth century of enlightment and historical research, the same supreme criterion of truth which they constituted in the very first century of the Church[9], Dr. Coppen's statement to the contrary notwithstanding.

* * * * *

We mentioned above that our Blessed Lady's Assumption, being a *theological* fact, should be examined and analyzed in the light of other theological truths, particularly those pertaining to the field of Mariology. That there exists a positive nexus between Mary's Assumption and the other mariological doctrines may be gathered from the fact that Mariology is a science in the proper sense of the word, with a fundamental principle which serves as a source and basis in relation to all its integral parts, enables them to illustrate and corroborate one another, and gives them the systematic coherence which is imperative in every true science.

This being the case, theologians are wont to study our Blessed Lady's Assumption in its relation to the other mariological truths so as to determine to what extent the latter may furnish a theological argument in favor of the former. Thus, some feel that from an analysis of Mary's divine maternity we may logically conclude to her bodily Assumption into heaven. Others contend that the latter prerogative is implicitly (though necessarily) contained in the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception. Others again argue from the fact of Mary's perpetual virginity, while not a few see our doctrine implicitly contained in our Blessed Lady's prerogative as co-redemptrix of mankind.

---

[9] Cf. D. Van den Eynde, O.F.M., *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles*, (Gembloux, 1933), p. 76, n. 3.

Needless to say that the various views referred to are not exclusive of one another. In fact, they are usually brought forth as a combined argument to bolster the doctrine under discussion. The divergence of opinion among our theologians begins when they attempt to ascertain the degree of certitude with which we may infer the Assumption from the above mentioned truths. Let us briefly examine each argument, pointing out its weakness or its strength, as the case may be.

(A) *The Divine Maternity.* The argument is frequently formulated as follows: It is impossible to assume that the body of her who conceived and gave birth to the God-man and who, by that very fact, was endowed with an almost infinite dignity, should be indefinitely confined to the state of death. Therefore, the divine maternity necessarily requires Mary's bodily Assumption.[10]

Frankly, we do not quite see that necessity. We have here, to be sure, an *argumentum ex convenientia* of the highest degree, if you will, but *ex convenientia*, for all that. Nor does this line of reasoning take on an additional cogency by stressing the fact, as some do, that it would be *unbecoming* on the part of Christ to allow the body of His worthy Mother to remain in the state of death, and that it is *impossible* for the God-man to do what is unbecoming.

The weakness of the argument lies in the assumption that whatever is unbecoming according to our limited mind is also unbecoming from God's viewpoint. Humanly speaking it would seem unbecoming for the supreme Lord of creation to be born in a stable in the midst of extreme poverty, or to die the ignominious death of the cross between two thieves. And yet all this was willed by God for higher reasons which fitted admirably in His ineffably sublime economy.

---

[10] Thus, among others, Fr. Crisóstomo de Pamplona, O.F.M.Cap., "La Asunción basada en los grandes privilegios marianos," in *Estudios Marianos*, VI (1947), 270 ff.

It must be borne in mind that we are here considering the divine maternity in its purely essential concept, that is, in as much as it implies the conceiving and giving birth to the God-man and the consequent quasi-infinite dignity of God's Mother. We are, therefore, abstracting from any other privilege or aspect which, although not necessarily implied in the concept of divine motherhood, is *de facto* connected with it in the present dispensation. And we are of the opinion that the divine maternity in *this* sense does not seem to furnish an apodictic argument in favor of the *revealed* character of Mary's Assumption. In other words, a mere analysis of the concept of divine maternity does not disclose the concept of Assumption.

(B) *The Immaculate Conception.* Some grave theologians see in this truth an implicit revelation of Mary's Assumption. Thus we read in Pohle-Preuss: "But there is one strictly dogmatic consideration which sweeps away all doubt in the corporal assumption of our Lady. As the Mother of God Mary was conceived without original taint, free from concupiscence, and absolutely exempt from personal sin; therefore she could not possibly be subject to the dominion of death up to the time of the general resurrection. We have shown on a previous page that her exemption from original sin necessarily involves exemption from the penalties of sin."[11]

It is undeniable that we are faced here with a very strong argument in favor of our thesis; indeed much stronger than the previous one. The Sacred Scriptures (e.g. *Gen.* 2: 17; *Rom.* 5: 12) do establish a positive nexus between sin and death. However, in order to show that our doctrine is formally implicitly revealed in the revelation of Mary's absolute exemption from sin, it would have to be proved that death, whether permanent or transitory, is *always and necessarily* a punishment due to sin, even after Christ paid our debt on the cross. And this is what some grave theologians will not admit. Besides, we have a decision of the Council of Trent according to which the sacrament of Baptism completely remits not only the guilt of original sin but also *all* punishment due to it (*DB*, 807). And yet most Christians, even while in possession of baptismal grace, not only die but are also subject to corruption until the day of the general resurrection. The Angelic Doctor, although writing before the time of the Council of Trent, gives us a cue to a possible solution of this difficulty by distinguishing between punishments due to the *person* and punishments due to the *nature* (*Sum. theol.* III, q. 69, a. 3, ad 3). According to this, the decision of the Council may well refer to the former, not to the latter. We say that this is a *possible* solution, for the Council speaks of *all* punishment, without making any distinction. Hence the difficulty seems to remain. At any rate, we believe that the doctrine of Mary's Assumption may be drawn from her Immaculate Conception by a somewhat different process which would give us a "theological conclusion." In this sense Pius IX could rightly say: "The Assumption, as it is believed by the faithful, is undoubtedly a *consequence* of the dogma of her Immaculate Conception."[12]

---

[11] Pohle-Preuss, *Mariology* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1926), pp. 111 ff. Fr. Jugie (*op. cit.*, pp. 624, 628, 639), arrives at the same conclusion, but by a different and quite original process.

(C) *Mary's Perpetual Virginity.* Some theologians formulate the argument as follows: it is a revealed truth that Mary remained a perfect virgin before, in, and after the birth of Christ. The virginity *in partu*, of itself, necessarily implies an absolute immunity from the curse of *Gen.* 3: 16: "In dolore paries filios." But this particular curse referring to the pain connected with childbirth is only one of the punishments resulting from original sin. Therefore, if Mary was immune from this, it is logical to suppose that she was likewise immune from the corruption of the grave, which is but another aspect of the same general curse.[13]

In our humble opinion the above argument is not entirely convincing as a proof that our Lady's Assumption is *formally implicitly revealed.* And the reason is quite obvious: From the fact that Mary is free from one aspect of the general curse, it does not necessarily follow (by way of simple analysis, mind you) that she is also free from all the other aspects of the same. As Fr. Crisóstomo de Pamplona says (*art. cit.*, p. 279): The Church punishes the sin of abortion with excommunication and irregularity. But could immunity from one necessarily imply immunity from the other? The two punishments are perfectly separable, although resulting from one and the same sin.

---

[12] Pius IX, in a letter to Queen Isabella of Spain; cf. Hentrich-De Moos, *op. cit.*, II, 739.

[13] On the whole argument, consult Prof. C. Friethoff, O.P., "De doctrina Assumptionis corporalis B. Mariae Virginis rationibus theologicis illustrata," in *Angelicum*, XV (1938), 3-16.

Besides, even supposing that the concept of virginal integrity implied the concept of corporeal incorruptibility, the argument would not necessarily establish the fact of Mary's *anticipated* resurrection. At best it would prove that Mary's body was not subject to the corruption of the grave. But this privilege has been granted by God to many of his saints, without thereby granting them the privilege of an anticipated resurrection. Mary's virginity, then, the same as her Immaculate Conception, can lead us to the Assumption not by way of simple analysis, but by way of a theological deduction the exact process of which it is not our intention to discuss now.

(D) *Mary's Co-redemption.* If the three previous attempts have failed to disclose to us the formally revealed character of Mary's Assumption, perhaps we may obtain more satisfactory results by appealing to the doctrine of her Co-redemption which is considered by not a few as fundamental in the whole mariological system. In order to prevent unnecessary difficulties and misconceptions let us begin by stating that we now abstract from the question of the terminology used to express that doctrine. Whether our readers favor the use of the word "co-redemptrix" or not, they will unquestionably accept the truth which it conveys, at least in its broader sense. As for ourselves, we prefer to retain that title, following in this the usage of the Holy See[14] and sharing the almost unanimous attitude of both Catholic theologians and devotional writers.[15]

Co-redemption, by its very definition, means the intimate and formal co-operation of our Blessed Lady with her divine Son throughout the process of man's redemption. This type of co-redemption, which no Catholic will refuse to accept, is sufficient, it could seem, to furnish a legitimate theological argument in favor of the revealed character of Mary's Assumption. The argument may be formulated more or less along these lines: the manner in which Christ fulfilled His office as Redeemer of the human race was precisely by obtaining a *complete* and *total* victory over the devil and his dominion; which victory culminated in His anticipated glorious resurrection. Now, our Blessed Lady, being the co-redemptrix of mankind, shared Christ's identical victory over the devil and his dominion. Therefore, she, too, enjoyed the privilege of an anticipated glorious resurrection.[16]

---

[14] Cf. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., "The Holy See and the Title of Co-redemptrix," in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XXXVII (1937), 746 ff.

[15] Cf. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., *The Blessed Virgin's Co-redemption Vindicated* (Quaracchi-Florence, 1937); also the same author's "Episcopatus Catholicus et Beatae Mariae Virginis Co-redemptio," in *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.*, XVI (1939), 801-28; and his "Pio XII e la corredenzione di Maria," in *Marianum*, I (1939), 361 ff.

It should be noted that the above is a syllogism improperly so-called; in other words, one in which the conclusion is arrived at, not mediately or after the fashion of the usual theological deduction, but rather immediately or by means of a simple analysis of concepts. This is important, for if the premises are shown to be formally revealed, then it necessarily follows that the conclusion is likewise formally revealed, though implicitly. Let us now examine the premises and see whether their revealed character can be established on solid grounds.

As to the major, there can be no question among Catholic theologians since Sacred Scripture is quite explicit on this point. Thus, immediately after the fall of our first parents God foretold the coming of a Redeemer who would crush the serpent's head (*Gen.* 3: 15), that is, would completely overthrow the devil's empire. And Saint Paul tells us that Christ gained that victory over Satan precisely as our Redeemer, namely: "Blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us . . . fastening it to the cross" (*Col.* 2: 14-15). That this victory extended to bodily death is evident from the epistle to the Hebrews (2:14): ". . .that through death He might destroy him who had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil." That this victory, being total and complete, required an anticipated resurrection may be gathered from the epistle to the Romans (6:9): "Christ rising again from the dead, dieth no more, death shall no more have dominion over him." Hence if Christ had remained dead, even with an incorrupt body, His victory would not have been total and complete. Besides, the resurrection had a soteriological significance in the present dispensation and as such it was demanded by Christ's office as Redeemer, according to *Rom.*

---

[16] On the argument consult Prof. F. X. Mueller's splendid treatise: *Origo divino-apostolica doctrinae evectionis Beatissimae Virginis ad gloriam coelestem quoad corpus* (Innsbruck, 1930), pp. 32 68.

4:25: "Who was delivered up for our sins, and *rose again for our justification.*" Indeed, the Apostle informs us that without the anticipated resurrection the work of our redemption would have been incomplete: "If Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for *you are yet in your sins*" (I *Cor.* 15:17). It is evident, then, that Christ's anticipated glorious resurrection was an integral part of His total and complete victory over Satan.

The minor premise, namely, that our Blessed Lady, being the co-redemptrix of mankind, shared Christ's identical victory over the devil, may be established from the following twofold heading: (A) The Protoevangelium; and (B) The *Magisterium ordinarium.*

(A) *The Protoevangelium.* Since we have on a previous occasion discussed this matter in a rather lengthy dissertation,[17] we may be dispensed from reproducing here every aspect of the argument in question. It will suffice to recall the bare outline of the reasoning previously adopted.

In the Protoevangelium (*Gen.* 3:15) Almighty God, immediately after cursing the devil for having introduced sin and death into the world by the joint causality of Adam and Eve, solemnly foretells that He will set up absolute enmities between the devil and the woman, between her seed and his seed, and that his power and dominion shall be completely crushed by the seed of the woman. Since the seed of the woman is Christ, that woman can be none other than our Blessed Lady, and indeed according to the literal sense, as we have abundantly proved elsewhere.[18] Now Christ carried out His enmities against the devil and utterly crushed his head precisely in His capacity as Redeemer of mankind (as we saw above); and since the woman (Mary) is here shown to be closely associated to Christ in *that* struggle and in *that* victory, it follows that she, too, gained a total victory over the devil and his dominion.

In other words, while uttering the first messianic prophecy, God solemnly announces that, even as the devil had succeeded in establishing his reign over men by means of a man and a woman (Adam and Eve), He would completely overthrow the devil's empire and restore men to divine friendship by means of another

---

[17] Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., "Utrum B. Virginis Co-redemptio sit in S. Scriptura formaliter revelata," in *Marianum,* I (1939), 283-326.

[18] Cf. *Marianum,* I (1939), 295 ff.

Man and woman, the New Adam and the New Eve, the Redeemer and the co-redemptrix.

This basic doctrine of Mary as the New Eve who, together with the New Adam (although entirely subordinated to Him) would undo the work of Satan and utterly destroy his power, has been constantly and universally believed in the Church from the remotest times, as we have shown on a previous occasion.[19] This, of course, does not mean that the Fathers and early writers perceived the many doctrinal implications which later theologians discovered in that primitive idea.[20] But the unquestionable fact remains that they unhesitatingly accepted that doctrine as being the expression of God's will as manifested in the whole economy of man's spiritual restoration.

(B) *The Magisterium Ordinarium.* The teaching of the Church on this point is clearly set forth in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* (Dec. 8, 1854) in which Pius IX solemnly promulgated the dogma of our Blessed Mother's Immaculate Conception. The Pope states: "The Fathers and writers of the Church . . . while narrating the words with which God . . . reversed the audacity of the deceitful serpent . . . saying: 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed,' taught that in this divine oracle the merciful Redeemer of the human race, namely, Christ-Jesus, the only-begotten Son of God, was clearly and openly foretold, as was also His most Blessed Mother, the Virgin Mary, and that, simultaneously, the *very same enmities of both* towards the devil were *strikingly* expressed."[21]

But, it may be asked: in what precisely does that enmity between Mary and the devil consist according to the papal document? In other words, what is the nature of that struggle leading to a decisive triumph? May all this be adequately explained by the sole fact of Mary's immunity from sin? Or is that immunity from sin rather one aspect of that struggle and total triumph? The words of the Holy Father immediately following the above text do not seem to leave any room for doubt on the matter. He says: "Therefore, just as Christ, the Mediator between God and men, having assumed our human nature, blotted out the handwriting of the decree which stood against us and triumphantly affixed it to the cross; so likewise the most holy Virgin, united with Him by a most intimate and indissoluble bond, together with Him and through Him waged a perpetual warfare against the poisonous serpent and, completely triumphing over him, crushed his head with her immaculate foot."

---

[19] Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., "De fundamento proximo Co-redemptionis Marianae," in *Marianum*, I (1939), 173-87.

[20] Cf. Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., "De sanctorum Patrum doctrina circa B. Virginis Co-redemptionem," in *Marianum*, II (1940), esp. pp. 264-66.

[21] Cf. *Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum. Collectio Lacensis*, (Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1882), VI, 839.

It must be observed that in the first section of the above quotation the Pope identifies the crushing of the serpent's head by Christ with the latter's redemptive work. This we already knew from the explicit teaching of St. Paul. Now, immediately after identifying the crushing of the serpent's head with Christ's redemptive work, the Holy Father adds: "*So likewise* the most holy Virgin, together *with Him* and through Him, waged a perpetual warfare against the poisonous serpent and, *completely triumphing* over him, *crushed his head*..." Note that the Pope does not say simply "through Him," but also "*with* Him." Hence, our Blessed Lady cannot be said to have crushed the serpent's head by the sole fact that she gave birth to the Redeemer. According to the very text of the papal document, the complete overthrow of the devil's empire (namely, the objective work of ourRedemption) is the result of *two* joint and immediate agents, although the causality of our Blessed Lady in the whole process is, of course, entirely subordinated to that of Christ from Whom it derived its very existence and all its efficacy. Christ, then, remains our *only* principal, absolutely necessary and independent Mediator and Redeemer, because He, and He *alone*, destroyed the dominion of Satan by His own power.

It follows from all this that Mary's immunity from sin is not to be identified with her total victory over Satan, as if the two concepts were coextensive. The former is rather a necessary prerequisite of the latter, for how could she co-redeem us from sin if she herself were stained by sin? Or, if you will, her exemption from sin was only a partial aspect of that total victory. It is precisely because that immunity from sin is implied in the total victory as a part is implied in the whole, that Pius IX was able to adduce the Protoevangelium as an argument in favor of the Immaculate Conception.

This interpretation of the Protoevangelium which we have just seen in Pius IX's Bull is furthermore corroborated with the authority of many members of the Catholic hierarchy at the time of the Vatican Council. One of their petitions (signed by 113 bishops and archbishops) requesting the definition of our Blessed Lady's Assumption, begins as follows: "Most Holy Father: Since according to the apostolic teaching, as recorded in *Rom.* 5-8; *I Cor.* 15: 24, 26, 54, 57; *Heb.* 2: 14-15 and other texts, the triumph which Christ gained over Satan, the ancient serpent, consists of a *threefold* victory over sin and its effects, concupiscence and death; and *since in Gen.* 3:15 *the Mother of God is shown as being associated in a unique manner in this triumph with her Son,* which is also the unanimous opinion of the Fathers, we do not doubt that in the aforesaid prophecy [the Protoevangelium] this same Blessed Virgin was foretold as being prominent by that threefold victory; and therefore, that same passage [Gen. 3:15] foretells her singular triumph over hostile death by an anticipated resurrection similar to that of her Son, the same as it foretells her victory over sin by her Immaculate Conception, and over concupiscence by her virginal motherhood."[22]

To the above noteworthy testimony we may add two other petitions submitted to the Holy Father in the first decade of the century by a considerable number of bishops and archbishops urging the definition of the same doctrine. In one of them, endorsed by eighty-six Ordinaries, we read, among other reasons brought forth in favor of the doctrine: "It is *evident* that the privilege of the Assumption fits in admirably with the title and office of Mary as *co-redemptrix of the human race.*"[23] The other petition, signed by thirty bishops and archbishops, is more trenchant and remarkable still. It reads: "The same privilege of the Assumption is implied (continetur) in the *revealed* doctrine of Mary's *co-redemption.*"[24] Why comment on such splendid testimonies? They speak for themselves.

From all that precedes it is quite clear that the Magisterium of the Church, represented here by Pope Pius IX and a considerable number of bishops from practically every country in the world, abundantly endorses the truth of our contention as expressed in the minor premise of our previous syllogism. Hence, the conclusion of that syllogism can be none other than this: our Blessed Lady, the same as Christ, enjoyed the privilege of an anticipated glorious resurrection. And since a glorified body must be where the soul is, and Mary's soul is certainly in heaven, therefore Mary is in heaven with her glorified body and soul.

---

[22] Cf. *ibid.*, VII, 869 f.

[23] Cf. Hentrich-De Moos, *op. cit.*, II, 728 f.

[24] Cf. *Ibid.*, II, 728; I, 32.

It might be objected in this connection that if our Lady's victory over death is as perfect and complete as the writer has claimed throughout this paper, it would follow rather that Mary could not (and hence did not) undergo natural death, which conclusion seems to run counter to the universal belief of the Church.

The difficulty may be obviated by remembering that our Lady's victory is an *associated* one; in other words, she triumphs over Satan (and hence over death) through her close association with Christ, whose victory she intimately shares, as we saw above. Now, Christ triumphed over death, not by remaining alive, i.e. by not dying, but precisely by not remaining dead, i.e. by His anticipated glorious resurrection, according to *Rom.* 6:9. Hence, our Blessed Lady, because of her share in *that* victory ("arctissimo et indissolubili vinculo," as Pius IX expresses it) triumphed over death, not by remaining alive, i.e. by not dying, but rather by her anticipated glorious resurrection.

Another objection which may be raised against the value of our conclusion is this: if to triumph with Christ over the devil demands an anticipated resurrection on the part of our Blessed Lady, then all the followers of Christ should be granted a similar privilege, for they all share the Saviour's victory over the evil spirit.

The difficulty vanishes when we recall that the specific victory which *Gen.* 3:15 attributes to Christ in a literal sense refers exclusively to His redemptive work, as we pointed out above. And in *this* victory we do not share as co-agents but as beneficiaries. Our triumph over Satan supposes Christ's (and Mary's) victory, i.e., the redemptive work, *already completed*. In other words, we are able to wage a warfare against the evil spirit and gain a victory over him only after the fruits of the redemptive work have been applied to us. Hence, if the triumph foretold in *Gen.* 3:15 may be predicated of Christ's followers, it is done only through an *accomodated* sense (*Rom.* 16: 20), which is not a biblical sense at all.[25]

In conclusion: the doctrine of our most Blessed Mother's anticipated resurrection and glorious Assumption into heaven is formally implicitly revealed in the total and complete victory which our Lady, as co-redemptrix of the human race, gained over Satan and his power. Hence, we fail to understand the timidity and hesitation manifested by some recent writers in connection with the solemn definition which the Holy Father seems to be contemplating.

We have endeavored to show the revealed character of the doctrine, not by the *purely historical* method which would lead to rather disappointing results, but by appealing mainly to the *Magisterium Ordinarium.* Nor do we apologize for having adopted this method, for we do not believe that recourse to the teaching authority of the Pope and the Bishops is (in the words of a recent scholar of note) like "a handy life-belt to those who have suffered shipwreck in the science of theology." This attitude, besides being incredible in a Catholic, can only lead to disastrous results in the field of theology. It is the firm conviction of the present writer that, in doctrinal matters, the *Magisterium Ordinarium* is *always* right. He will continue to stand fast by that authority.

JUNIPER B. CAROL, O.F.M.

Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano,
Rome, Italy.

---

[25] A different solution to these objections has been successfully attempted by the well known Spanish exegete, J. M. Bover, S.J., in his recent articles: "La Asunción corporal de la Virgen Maria a los cielos en la S. Escritura," in *Revista Española de Teología,* VI (1946), 163-83; and "Analogía entre la resurrección de Cristo y la de María," in *Estudios Eclesiásticos,* XX (1946), 545 ff.

MISSION INTENTION

"That Christian principles be followed in dealing with the Japanese workingmen" is the Mission Intention for the month of March, 1948.

APOSTLE OF THE PARISIAN WORKERS

More than one apostolic figure has realized in some degree the quasi-prophetic lines in which a great apostle, St. Grignion de Montfort, traced the portrait of the apostles of the last days:

> What will these servants, slaves, children of Mary be? A burning fire will these ministers of the Lord be, spreading the fire of divine love everywhere. . . . Children of Levi, completely purified by great tribulations and completely attached to God, bearing the gold of the love of Jesus Christ to the poor and the little ones. . . . True apostles of the last days to whom the Lord of hosts will give words and power to work wonders. . . . They will sleep without gold and silver and, what is more, without solicitude in the midst of the other priests, ecclesiastics and clerics; and they will nevertheless have the silvered wings of the dove to enable them to go, with a pure intention for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, wherever the Holy Spirit calls them; and they will leave behind them in the places where they have preached nothing but the gold of their charity. . . . They will be the true disciples of Jesus Christ, following the traces of His poverty, humility, contempt for the world, charity; teaching the narrow way of God in the pure truth according to the holy Gospel, without anxiety and without acceptance of persons. . . . Such will be the great men who will come, made by Mary, by order of the Most High, to extend His empire over the empire of the impious.

Perhaps no one has come closer to a literal fulfilment of these words than the Abbé Henri Godin, founder of the *Mission of Paris*, an apostolic innovation devised to meet the situation so strikingly described in the Abbé's famous book, *Is France a Mission Country?*[1] It is the purpose of this article to acquaint the readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* with the many-sided figure of a priest who achieved apostolic miracles in his short life and who continues to work even greater ones since his, to our too human views, untimely death.

---

[1] Within two years of the death of Abbé Godin, whom I shall henceforth call Fr. Godin, two books have appeared concerning him. One is a collection of *Témoignages sur l'abbé Godin* (1945). The other is Canon Glorieux' *Un homme providentiel, l'abbé Godin* (1946), in which practically all the testimonies of the earlier work are incorporated. The second book is not a definitive life or a complete biography; but whatever of good the present article contains is from it.

The future apostle of the urban masses of Paris was born on April 13 (Good Friday), 1906, at Audeux, a hamlet of one hundred inhabitants in the department of Doubs, in the ancient Franche-Comté, a part, then and now, of Catholic France. Henri already had a sister, Marie-Louise, and was to have a brother, Louis. His father, the very poorly-paid town clerk, was able to do most of his work at home. It was not easy for the family to make both ends meet. His parents were of "the people," the solid, hard-working, simple, practical, sharp-witted people who form the backbone of France, and from them he derived his *temperament peuple*, as he called it, a temperament with which he was born. "*Je suis né peuple*, and shall I betray this people?"[2] His whole life was to be determined by an unusual consciousness of the betrayal that it would be for him to desert the simple life that came to him from the people. The family atmosphere was one of happy piety, of love of God and devotion to the Virgin. The family usually attended Sunday Vespers, and when they did not, the father read them aloud to the family in Latin. Henri made his first Communion at six. His desire to be a priest dated from that period, and in every Communion he asked Jesus through Mary to keep him from being a priest, if he were going to be a mediocre one. He was then dreaming of being a foreign missioner, a dream his poor health was to force him to abandon. At school he liked French composition and mathematics, but spelling from the first was not for him, and he must frequently have longed for the good old days when, to use George Eliot's expression, "spelling was a matter of private judgment." His bad spelling was to plague him all his life, until he developed or affected a certain pride in it, when he began to realize that his bizarre orthography and his accent of the Franche-Comté conferred a useful distinction on him.

The family had moved to Recologne about the beginning of the war. The pastor, observing the boy's delicate health, tried to turn his thoughts away from the priesthood, but a priest acquaintance of his mother's encouraged him and arranged for the entrance of Henri and his brother into the minor seminary in 1919. He passed the years from 1919 to 1926 in the minor seminaries of Counterfontaine and Vaux-sur-Poligny, in the diocese of Saint-Claude. He was an outstanding student, and was fortunate enough to find teachers, especially in French composition, able to make allowances for his spelling, which remained erratic despite the heroic, and sometimes misguided, attempts he made to get the better of it, such as renouncing walks in order to memorize whole sections of the dictionary. His companions thought him a good talker and story teller, and they remember his animated face and lively gestures, but especially his docility and obedience, his sanctity. His notes make it clear that the perfection others observed in him was not, as they thought, natural to him, but the result of a relentless struggle. In 1925, for instance, on his return from the vacation, although he feels that philosophy is "the most stupid thing imaginable," and all the worse for keeping him from the "suffering, weeping world and the souls rushing to damnation," he forces himself to accept the fact that God wants him in the seminary and wants him to love philosophy, and that he can, in these conditions, do more for these souls inside the seminary than he could outside it. His retreat notes show how severely he judges himself, with complete honesty and not the slightest sign of pose. He was dubbed "the monk," because many thought that he was headed for the Trappists, the Carthusians or the Benedictines. It never entered into anyone's mind to think of him as a missionary among the workers. But he was already coming to suspect his future vocation himself.

---

[2] This article will contain a number of quotations from his notes. These notes began with his seminary days and, happily, were not destroyed.

God reveals his plans in many ways. When, in February, 1926, violent and almost continual headaches, the culmination of years of bad health which had been disregarded rather than cared for, forced Henry Godin to leave the seminary, many appear to have thought that he would never return. But in reality this enforced absence was to prove decisive in disclosing to the seminarian the specific vocation that was his. The poverty of his family was such that a prolonged rest in the pleasant surroundings and mild climate of the Midi was out of the question. Indeed, any rest at all was equally so. Henri took a job in a small chemical house in Lons-le-Saunier, where his work was often heavy and dangerous, and always dirty. Awkward at first, though handy with his hands, and never tidy, he did his work faithfully and quite satisfactorily. His notes show that, far from considering his preparation for the priesthood interrupted, he saw in it a special opportunity. Now he knew what it was to be himself a worker. His daily meditation helped him to practice recollection and to be conscientious at his work, and he did what he could, during and apart from his work, in the way of the apostolate. In 1923, and again in 1925, he had been to Lourdes, where he had acted as a *brancardier*. Twice this year, in May and September, he went again, not as a *brancardier*, but to ask, if not for health, at least for the possibility of continuing his studies. But he went primarily to renew his contact with the Virgin, and she, who knew that he would not be a mediocre priest, did not fail him.

October of the same year found him well enough to enter the major seminary of the diocese at Montciel, where he was to remain until 1930. His associates there remember him as constantly in poor health, and one of them, exaggerating, recalls his seminary courses as "one month of studies and two months at home." His notes record the important dates: reception of the cassock, Jan. 23, 1927, tonsure on Oct. 13, 1929, first minors on April 5, 1930, second minors on June 4, 1930, all of them occasions of unflinching self-examination resulting in courageous resolutions. He was fully aware that his weak health called for him to put forth special efforts to compensate for it. "If I become a holy seminarian, the situation (that is, the state of his health as a sign of a lack of vocation) is changed . . . This holiness, useful for others, is for me *necessary, if I want to be a priest.*" Not only did he want to be a priest, but a priest who would need the strength of Hercules.

> I want to work for souls, nothing but souls, directly or indirectly. Shall I be a priest to cultivate a garden or to care for bees? . . . I know what work is; I have tried it. Now I don't want the priesthood to give me a softer life than I would have had if I had never thought of it. . . . Sacrifice is no substitute for labor, nor fasting for work. For the primary sacrifice is hard labor, and the primary penance is work.

Such were the ambitions of a seminarian who knew that he was "incapable . . . physically, exteriorly, intellectually, from the standpoint of spelling, morally, spiritually." The word *orthographiquement*, which I have translated "from the standpoint of spelling," shows that he was not taking himself too seriously, since he could not resist his little joke even in these notes to his Blessed Mother.

Indeed, always from a boy he had more than his share of humor, and he enjoyed playing pranks and telling jokes even throughout the most strenuous days of his priestly life. His resolutions are concrete and specific, concerning his classes, notes to be taken, reviews to be made, and concerning his hobby, wireless, which fascinated him to such an extent that he feared that it was ruining his religious life during his vacations.

In April, 1930, before first minors, he resolves that, when he is pastor, he will modernize and popularize the appeal of religion to the people, that he will ask their co-operation and allow them a good deal of initiative, that he will make them take their part in the Mass. In June, at last minors, he makes up his mind not to be a "priest-photographer, a priest-wireless enthusiast, a priest-beekeeper, a priest-gardener, a priest-mechanic, a priest-playboy" but "to be just a priest" and that not for family, mother, sister, but for God and to save souls. And he is telling himself once more that for him "it is all or nothing."

These were his last resolutions at Montciel, and the pastorate he was thinking of was not in the diocese of Saint-Claude. Already the previous year he had decided, on the advice of his director, to join the Institute of the Sons of Charity.[3] The bishop had insisted that he take a year to think it over. When the period was up, the bishop consented, and Henri entered the novitiate at Draveil, near Paris, on Sept. 1, 1930, after having made the national pilgrimage to Lourdes.

The step was a logical one, however surprising it may have seemed to others. From the beginning he had felt that God was calling him to apostolic work, and with his mature understanding of the nature of priestly work in the predominantly rural diocese of Saint-Claude, he saw that it would be dangerous for him to be stuck in what he calls "some little hole." He was haunted by the fear that he might spend his priestly life tinkering with wireless, working two hours a day as a priest, when he knew that his nature demanded thorough and entire dedication. And from the time he had entered the major seminary, he had begun to observe how his training was cutting him off from the people who had been his fellow-workers in Lons-le-Saunier. He was faced with the personal problem of losing his class, the problem of *déclassement* which would never cease to engage his attention. In the final analysis, although the books of Père Lhande on the Red suburbs of Paris may have had some influence on him, he appears to have decided to enter the Sons of Charity as a means of keeping close to the poor workers and of protecting himself against treachery to the class from which he sprang.

---

[3] Founded in 1918 by Fr. M. Anizan as a means of uniting the practice of the life of perfection in community with the parochial ministry, especially among the urban poor, it had more than 100 members when the founder died on May 1, 1928. The congregation now has charge of twenty-four parochial centers in the dioceses of Paris, Versailles, Cambrai, and Clermont-Ferrand.

Draveil was his home until he was ordained priest on April 15, 1933. He began the first year, his novitiate, with a retreat of thirty days. This year gave him an opportunity to give depth to his spiritual doctrine, and to adjust and harmonize his spiritual values. This process continued during the two years of studies at the Catholic Institute which followed the novitiate. He read the whole of St. Augustine during them, and showed a special aptitude for positive theology and practical psychology, especially the psychology of character. He was also able to make his first direct contacts with the life of the Parisian worker, both on the crowded trains that took him to the Catholic Institute and back, and in the work he was allowed to do in various parishes during vacation and on Thursdays and Sundays during the year.

An observer born, he took advantage of the opportunities, and already he was forming in himself the character and habits which would enable him to meet the huge apostolic problem of reaching the masses. He came to see that "without sacrifice, there is no love," that "love even unto blood" is a necessity, and that with people who see the priest often the one effective apostolic instrument is the priest's kindness, but with those the priest runs into only by accident, it is kindness united with poverty. He was already sacrificing his leisure to prepare a doctoral dissertation on the leisure of the working classes.

He became a subdeacon on March 26, 1932, a deacon on July 2 of that year. Before the subdiaconate, he begs the Blessed Virgin to keep him from becoming a bourgeois or a functionary, to give him a heart like hers, one capable of suffering. His ordination card revealed his priestly ambitions. It bore the words, "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold. Them also I must bring." His first Mass was celebrated the day after his ordination at the Grotto of Lourdes, where he had an appointment with his earthly as well as his heavenly mother.

He was appointed assistant, the fifth and last, in the well-established parish of St. Vincent de Paul in Clichy. The population, about forty thousand, was about four-fifths working class. One-eighth, perhaps, was really Catholic. Immediately, Fr. Godin was thrown into a whirl of work, confessions, preaching, visits to the sick, catechizing; in addition, he was charged with the supervision of the sacristy and the parish accounts. It was remarked that he had a rare gift for speaking about the Blessed Virgin. It was also quickly remarked, and by no less an authority than Georges Quiclet, the first national president of the J.O.C., that the new chaplain of the Clichy section, which Quiclet had founded and on which he kept an eye, was marvellously endowed for the work because of his understanding of the workers, "a Jocist chaplain one hundred per cent." His understanding of the workers was too profound to be pleasant for himself. It caused him almost anguish to see the estimate of the Catholic community by the rest of the Clichyites. The Catholics are

> . . . calm, sedate, credulous people, rather tame, generally old, eighty per cent women. They like to pass their spare time at the church . . . on the Boulevard Jean-Jaurès; it holds about as many people as the Select-Cinéma, but its showings are never "continuous" like those of the Cinéma. They let themselves be exploited by the priests who live on funerals and on what they get from the collections which are as frequent as they are varied.

Such a picture, which good judges think substantially exact as a popular estimate, was hardly an alluring one. The fifth and last assistant, the *vicaire sacristan*, felt that it was altogether intolerable and that something had to be done about it. But he could see little dynamism in the parochial organization. He finally decided, after long consultation with the Blessed Virgin and with his director, that he had "no vocation to be the *vicaire sacristan* of Clichy." His triennial vows expired on Oct. 1, 1934, and he did not renew them. Canonically, everything was in order. But he was too wise to expect that he would be judged from the standpoint of canonical correctness alone, and his own bishop intimated, with all the tact he could command, that Fr. Godin was showing himself capricious and unstable. Abbé Guérin, chaplain general of the J.O.C., to whom he turned, as one who might help him to realize the designs that he knew God had for him, received him with open arms. His bishop gave him permission to engage in the national organization of the J.O.C., and he was incardinated by Archbishop Feltin of Sens.

Fr. Godin had as yet only a haphazard and quite imperfect acquaintance with the J.O.C., although he was in complete sympathy with its main ideas. He had a lot still to learn concerning its origins, history, and principles, as well as its organization, its methods, and its daily life. To Abbé Guérin Lille seemed the ideal place for him to learn it. The J.O.C. was strongly established there, and besides, in connection with the Catholic Institute, there was a special school for *Missionaires de travail.* To Lille, accordingly, Fr. Godin went. He remained there until the end of June, 1935, studying, reading, observing, experiencing at first hand the problems and the misery of industrial workers in those very hard times, absorbing the technique of the J.O.C.

He was also at work on a thesis, on the old problem of *déclassement.* When he handed it in, it was so unsightly that he had to do it over again. When he finished it, someone else had taken the subject and the title. He kept at it, even after he left Lille, and in 1937 his thesis was finally accepted, but he was forbidden to publish it, because the public was not ready. The ideas, many of them at least, were incorporated in later works, and they played their part in the foundation of the Mission of Paris. The year at Lille was profitable to him in many indirect ways: it gave him the opportunity to put the finishing touches to his own personal spiritual principles and to his principles of direction; it also allowed him to experiment with means of increasing his apostolic drawing power. But it was not a pleasant year for him. He called Lille a land of exile. Even his native Franche-Comté was now a land of exile. He was not always understood in the North, nor did he always understand it.

In June of 1935 he returned to the Paris he understood and where he was understood. His center and residence was the General Secretariat of the J.O.C., Avenue Soeur-Rosalie. At that time he was the only priest, in addition to the Abbés Bordet and Guérin, attached to the General Secretariat, although some federal chaplains lent assistance as they could. The movement was growing by leaps and bounds, and from the outset Fr. Godin found plenty to do. He was to be associate federal chaplain, to take charge of the Pre-Jocist movement, to be federal chaplain of the Paris-Nord federation of the J.O.C. and the Vincennes federation of the J.O.C.F., to supervise the work in one sector of France, especially Jura, to begin the work for the sick, to be partly responsible for the editorial work on the Chaplain's Bulletin, to preach retreats and recollections here and there and everywhere, and to do his share of the work of the General Secretariat. As time went on, he did not hesitate to take on more work, especially the work of individual direction. And almost from the beginning, he began to write, snatching the time for this from his other duties, but mostly from the hours that should have been given to sleep.

If Fr. Godin had a hero, it was Pius XI. And if Pius XI was his hero, it was because he was the one who had made the real Catholic Action possible when he had declared that the lay apostolate had reached manhood and had confided to the laity the fate of the groups to which they belong, ordering them to work together and to organize in order to transform their environment. Catholic Action alone could achieve the quick change in the various conditions of life without which the average man could not be expected to live a Christian life.

Even in his seminary days, Fr. Godin had resolved that he would not treat the laity as mere instruments to do his work. He was the less likely to treat the lay apostles of Catholic Action as the chaplain's instruments. To him the chaplain's role was to be a fellow-seeker, but a fellow-seeker who supplies stimulation, confidence, zeal, enthusiasm, courage, guidance, everything but decisions and plans and methods. Fr. Godin, who had been studying the workers all his life, knew his people well, and it did not take them long to know him and to realize that he was one of them. Distracted and absent-minded, he could not remember names, but he remembered persons and everything about them. His cassock was always too short, his collar usually sticking out, his appearance in general rather unkempt. Sticklers for priestly decorum would have been scandalized at his playfulness, his showing his watch during a meeting or sticking pins in his neighbors, his arriving late for a sermon after having trouble with his machine, but going directly to the altar, his hands covered with grease, to begin his sermon. The people loved all these things, and, after the sermon referred to, the impression was, "There is a priest for you." He knew how to make Jesus live, as when he spoke in a talk about the sign that one day appeared over a carpenter's shop in Nazareth, "Closed because of departure" (*Fermé pour cause de départ*). He was not afraid, during the tragic days of 1936, to tell his young people that "in striking you will be working for the kingdom of God." Once he made the participants in a recollection begin the day by buying and reading the quite unspiritual newspaper *Paris-Soir*, which was at least an original approach. It was easy, we are told, if you did not know him well, to take him for a bit of a demagogue, or, if you knew him only from one or the other of his books, for a vulgarizer with a facile pen.

But his own, the young people of Paris-Nord, of the working-class quarters of the XVIIth and XVIIIth *arrondissements*, were allowed to know him well. To them he was a priest, a revelation of what a priest could be, what, almost without knowing it, they had expected a priest to be, a revelation of Christ. They hardly left him time to eat. He was soon overwhelmed with private spiritual direction, continued in the direction that he gave to his *jeunes foyers* ("young homes"), most of them graduates of his Jocist movements. In direction he tried hard to avoid the *plat de jour*, the well-compounded spiritual pill to serve all comers. It was his aim to make himself unnecessary as thoroughly and as quickly as possible. The J.O.C. work was new, and it was not of the kind in which "false love of tradition conceals a great deal of routine," as he had observed of parochial life. It was the kind of work for him. There was no traditional framework, no obligatory *horarium*. Every moment an unforeseen problem was liable to show itself. Trails were to be blazed; instruments had to be forged; methods needed to be devised. He was always non-conformist, and non-conformism was almost the rule of this work. He found it hard to co-operate, and he did not worry about following his own line rather than the program. He was something of a free lance, perhaps too much so.

He continues the pitiless self-examinations of his seminary days, noting his failings, his deficiencies, his weaknesses, with far less mercy than the most hostile critic, accusing himself of faults at which no outsider could possibly have guessed, of doing his work without spirit, for example, or of having little love for others. Several times he notes that he is too emotional, that his nerves are getting the better of him, that he must see a doctor or a psychologist. In his 1940 retreat he observes that he is too much given to dreaming, too timid in undertaking things, too soft, that he talks too much, and therefore lies. Can this, you ask yourself, be the same man who seemed to be able to be in ten places at once? But he goes on with his examination:

> All that from the human point of view. From the Christian point of view, which is much more important, it is much more serious: I still meditate (preparation for recollections). I live in a supernatural atmosphere. I have a living faith. But I no longer pray. I no longer talk with the *bon Dieu,* with Christ, with Our Lady. I am leading an independent life. I had never seen this so well as today. My God, I thank thee.

It is to us more understandable that he should write, "I am draining myself dry. . . . I no longer have anything to give."

Fr. Godin had always had a great respect for the power of the pen, and soon after he was settled on the Avenue Soeur-Rosalie, he was off on a writer's career. Between 1936 and 1944, he was responsible for the appearance of some sixteen works, not counting the new editions which frequently involved great changes. How he found time for them is his secret. His notes reveal his fears that his writings might be taking too much time from other duties, but periodical resolutions to restrict this work went by the board.

With one exception (*Is France a Mission Country*?), his books were published by the *Editions ouvrières* in Paris. 1936 saw the appearance of his first two works, both connected with his work in the Pre-Jocist movement, *The Chaplain and the Pre-Jocist Ideal* (or *Mentality*, in French *mystique*), and *Gospel Scenes for Children*. December, 1937, brought his first Missal, *We Offer the Mass with Christ and the Church* (abbreviated, *Avec le Christ*), which, though somewhat disconcerting to the devout, sent the Jocists into raptures. It was the first of many editions, each an improvement on its predecessor, each linking the Mass ever more closely with the daily life of the worker, and offering him with its prayers and illustrations an increasingly attractive view of his religion. The first adaptation of the Missal, *Soldier of Christ*, the date of which, Sept. 23, 1939, together with the title and the dedication to "Luc Postic, Federal President of Paris-Nord, *mort pour la France*," explains the tragic need to which it was an answer. It contained a Mass for each season of the year, and into these Masses the author had succeeded in putting the loveliest texts, adapted to the situation, along with prayers and readings and a few model meditations, of which the following one is an example:

> You see, my Lord, I worked hard yesterday; but not, as you know, like a Saint; rather like the poor fellow I am. For this life is not all roses. And so we keep going, but we kick, at least inside; we help others, but not always with a smile.
>
> So, this morning, as I come to offer this to Our Father who is in heaven . . . I am not very proud of my contribution. No; a poor human work, done in a poor human way, cannot purchase the infinite.
>
> That is why, my Lord Jesus, I want to put before you, very simply, like this, a proposition. You too have suffered, you too grew tired on the job, you toiled, you bled, you died, and you offer that each day to Our Father in heaven, at Mass, through the hands of the priest.
>
> If you wish, I will go to that Mass and I will place what I have to offer with your offering, with your own offering; and we will be so closely united at that moment that you will be able to present my efforts as if they were yours and it will be as if you had marched yesterday with the whole outfit. It will be the same as if you had carried my comrade's duffel-bag. In that case, I am sure of it, all this can buy heaven and win souls.
>
> And then, the boys of my squadron are fine fellows. They do as much as I do, but they never think of offering it. All in all, I am the most Christian one of the whole bunch. We will offer it together in their place. And all the miseries of this war too, the miseries of the front lines and those of the rear . . . And everything too that Christians are suffering, on both sides, and everywhere; and everything they are doing and everything they are hoping for, the Mass will mingle with your offering, like the drop of water which is put in the chalice, which mingles with the wine in such a way that it becomes, as it were, wine.
>
> And thou, Our Father, wilt accept this sacrifice, and thy life will be greater in the Church, and we shall merit peace.

The next book, *Christ on the Maginot Line*, made its appearance in April, 1940, barely in time to reach the front before the title was outmoded as the Maginot Line itself—the title, but not the book, which is perhaps Fr. Godin's best. A modern presentation of Christ and the Gospel, it sought to bring out the primacy of the first commandment. The author succeeded in putting into it a free translation or a paraphrase of the whole Gospel, as transposed and applied by his heroes, the fraternal band of nine gunners at their Battery 75, who make the discovery of Christ and Christianity under the wise influence and guidance of an attractive Jocist, Pastec (a name that hardly disguises the dead Luc Postic).

Fr. Godin was no longer in Paris. His health had exempted him from regular military service and thus he had not been called up in September of 1939. But many others had been mobilized, and his work had multiplied as a consequence. At the end of 1939, however, he was mobilized as a simple private. Stationed at Clermont-Ferrand, he enjoyed being one of the crowd. Now he could be a militant and no longer simply a chaplain. Military maneuvers interested him much less than apostolic ones. He kept in touch with his leaders in Paris, the girls especially, for whom these were trying times. He visited and put new life into several Jocist sections in the region of Clermont-Ferrand. He was always daring, and later, during the period of divided France, he enjoyed crossing the line in the clothes of a laborer. An episode of his life as a soldier illustrates his audacity:

> One day he was on his motorcycle when he saw a refugee with her children signal to a luxurious automobile to stop. The car continued on its way. Then the soldier Godin, without losing a minute, put on speed and circling the automobile, placed himself in its path, waving to it to stop.
>
> In the rear of the car a handsome lady was occupying the whole seat with her dogs. The soldier Godin opened the door, signed to her to get out, and shot the dogs with his revolver. Then he installed the refugee with her children and her belongings on the fine cushions, put the handsome lady up front with the chauffeur, and accompanied the car to the place where the refugee was going.
>
> Afterwards he remarked jokingly, "You see, after all, what a uniform can do!"

As soon after the disaster of June, 1940, as possible, Fr. Godin secured his discharge and returned to Paris, where he found that the occupation made his work more difficult, but no less urgent. He appears to have passed through a period of discouragement after demobilization. "The masses are escaping us," he told a priest friend at this time, "we are not reaching them." It was then that he met a White Father on furlough from the wonderful mission of Ruanda-Urundi, whose description of that mission, its relatively few priests and large number of catechists, justified the missioner's laughing verdict, "You people [in France] have not the slightest idea of what a mission is." The words, according to himself, had a great effect on him, making him see the necessity of re-thinking the methods by which he hoped to reach the masses. The whole problem was to engross his thoughts more and more. He kept up his regular work, and even accelerated his publications.

Singing Youth (*Jeunesse qui chante*), perhaps "the most successful of all post-war publications" in France, was published in 1941. It was a collection of songs, mostly, but not exclusively, the songs popular with the workers. The same year also saw the publication of the popular prayer book, *The Life of Christ in Us*, which was in part an adaptation of his previous Missals. 1942 brought three more books, *The Leaven in the Dough*, an exposition of the Christian life adapted to modern life and conditions, profusely illustrated and filled with quotations; *How to become Men*, a catechism of perseverance; *Living Youth* (*Jeunesse qui vit*). This last book represents a new departure, for it is the result of the collaboration of the group *jeunesse* with Fr. Godin. It is he who translates, puts in order, and presents to the public the real experiences of a real group of young people who in this work tell everything about the joyous side of their life, their vacations, their leisure, their sports, their amusements. Of the same nature is *Expanding Youth*: *The Discovery of Love* (*Jeunesse qui s'épanouit*: *A la découverte de l'amour*), in which, according to the introduction, it is intended to state everything clearly and simply because it takes light to kill unwholesome microbes and germs. The final book of this *Youth* series was *Youth at the work of Reconstruction*. It is an adaptation of *Christ on the Maginot Line*, and intends to show that it is in the charity of Christ alone that there is hope for the reconstruction of France and the world, and a solid basis for true peace. But it is no longer the gunners of Battery 75 who make the momentous discovery; they are replaced by a group of factory workers at their lunch hour or on their Christmas and Easter outings.

Another collection, the Noël series, was being published simultaneously. It was to have five parts, all of them dealing with diverse aspects of love and marriage. Only two appeared, *Christ and the Engagement* (*Le Christ dans les fiançailles*), in the form of letters of direction, and *Christ and the Building of the Home*, in the form of direction given, not to husband and wife in the confessional, but to them together, in the course of the simple meal the priest shares with them in their home.

> It is better for the priest to go to them. The atmosphere of the home is almost indispensable to the solution of the problems of the home, and there alone are to be found that peace and warm intimacy which will permit them both to open their hearts completely.
>
> The priest, who has renounced his right to found a home in order to help others, has grace of state from God to comprehend everything in holiness and purity, and it will be easy for them to open their souls to the priest, if they are open with one another, for they will speak before him as they speak when they are alone together.

Another volume of this series, one not precisely foreseen in the original plan, *Testimony of a Young Christian Home*, was an attempt to face the very grave problems that seem, to many moderns, to render the Christian ideal of morality and married love unreal and impossible in present conditions. The book presents witnesses to show that it is only a misconception of love, together with the disorders of our society, that lend a kind of plausibility to these objections, objections which must give way to the testimony of witnesses. Here are people who say that Christianity cannot be unreal because it has been real to them. The book, appearing almost simultaneously with the death of Fr. Godin, was his last gift to the many homes he had helped to establish.

Meanwhile, Fr. Godin had moved, in January of 1941, from the Avenue Soeur-Rosalie to 47, Rue Ganneron, in the middle of the XVIIIth *arrondissement*, where he occupied three small third-floor rooms at the top of the stairs. Abbé Guérin had been very reluctant to see him leave his rooms at the General Secretariat, where of course he continued his duties. The general secretary had even at first refused to hear of him leaving, knowing that Fr. Godin would then have no protection at all from the demands that others would make on him. But transportation was a problem in Paris that winter, a condition that pleaded in favor of the federal chaplain's residence in the midst of his own, and perhaps Abbé Guérin, when he finally gave in, felt obscurely that one of the providential reasons for the condition was that Fr. Godin might achieve the desire that had been driving him to to live in the same, or even worse, conditions than his workers. In the kitchen at the Rue Ganneron there was a gas heater, and it was there that Fr. Godin practically lived the first winter. His budget allowed him 540 francs a month for food, including one meal a day (at 11 francs) in a restaurant, his total budget for the month being 1,040 francs.[4]

The meals he took at home were of the simplest, boiled potatoes or an unpalatable kind of corn meal porridge. He frequently had others to share them, and to prepare them. Indeed, the young workers, leaders especially, were there at all hours. He had no privacy. His visitors made themselves at home, eating, singing, talking, playing the accordion, even sleeping there when it suited them. It was there that he heard most of the moving stories which he was to retell so effectively in *France, pays de mission?*—stories such as this story of John:

> John is an anarchist. He has tatooed on his chest this declaration, "Neither God nor master." He was wounded during the trouble in Clichy in 1937, in which he himself used a gun.
>
> John was converted and it was easy; he has a generous temperament, a nature that needs an ideal. The ideal of Christ took complete possession of him; the Person of the Saviour has him "all wrapped up." We prepared him for his first Communion; he read the Gospel, and certain passages of St. Paul were explained to him. He is ready . . .
>
> But during one of our enforced absences, a nun tries to complete his instruction, and, on our return, we find everything destroyed.
>
> We could not understand it. John was heroically generous, ready for any sacrifice demanded by the Love of Christ. What had happened? We saw John again.
>
> Indeed, he loves Christ the same as ever and is ready to be killed for him, even ready to make all kinds of small sacrifices. . . . But John does not want to allow all kinds of prohibitions, a whole police code the connection of which with the love of God he does not see.
>
> He is wrong: all these precepts, all these precautions are dictated by a consummate prudence, the prudence of people who have experience of life; but John lacks this experience, and, being young, he does not wish to accept it.
>
> He is wrong: but must he accept it in order to be allowed to begin his religious life?
>
> John knows how he should conduct himself with young girls, he has sworn to do so, he is sure that he can (how presumptuous you are, O

---

[4] I think the value of the franc was then about (probably less than) two cents.

John!), he has done so for a month: then why is he forbidden to go on a mixed camping excursion, since there is nothing wrong in it?

There is no doubt that John loves Christ; yet he has kept his own vocabulary which is, we can assure you, terribly expressive and overflowing with life, but also terribly crude. Now is that a sin? If he wants to be a Christian, must he forego talking with his comrades? Not at all. If Christ is truly a brother, if he was a worker himself, he must understand. John wears his cap at an angle and floppy trousers [*pantalon à patte*—perhaps a Gallic zoot-suit?], but what harm can that do to Christ? Then it is impossible to be a worker and a Christian? . . It took us three months to do the work over again, and John made a magnificent first Communion.

He continues to love Christ passionately, and *he is discovering little by little* that certain things aid this love; when he makes the discovery, he does them with complete generosity. He is still a monstrosity, if you compare him to our conventional type of Catholic, but he is not a monstrosity with the youths of his environment, for he continues always "in contact."

He is now engaged to Suzette. . . . Suzette is already bringing greater delicacy into his life and John's religion is gradually profiting by it.

The children of this home, who will no doubt walk straight in the path of virtue, assisted by a clout on the head when needed, will discover new delicacies of the love of God, but we think that it will be necessary to wait for the grandchildren to find a Christianity that is on the whole complete and delicate.

"Our poverty must show them that we are not in it for the money," he had written before he was a priest, and he had left Clichy mainly because he felt that it would never give him a chance to show them. Now, living in their midst in greater poverty than most of them, he was giving the one testimony they could not refuse. In the beginning of his work in Paris his aim had seemed to be first of all to understand the worker's psychology and to formulate a theory for pastoral work among the laboring masses. Then he had come to see that it was necessary to live like them and among them. He was satisfied that he had been right, but he soon saw that it was not yet enough. There was needed not so much the presence of a priest in a more or less unofficial capacity, but the presence of Christ and the Church through a priest commissioned by the hierarchy, a priest-missionary for the workers.

The book we have mentioned a number of times, *Is France a*

Mission Country? written in collaboration with another Jocist chaplain, appeared at Lyons in September, 1943, as

> . . . the reflection, deeply personal and deeply painful, of two priests, the one an assistant in a parish, the other a *missionaire de travail*, both alike Jocist chaplains. After ten years of work, each in his own way, they stopped and threw a glance back over the path they had covered. They saw that, although the wood was beaten up in every direction, their tracks always ran up against the same closed barrier. They had to recognize that it was the same for those confreres of theirs who had taken part in the same hunt, the conquest of the people, and for the laity carried away by the same ambition. Thus they considered it a duty in conscience to warn others of, or acquaint them with, the nature of this impenetrable barrier against which all efforts meet death.

Overwhelming evidence is advanced to illustrate the point of this book, the necessity, that is, of letting the converts from the working masses form, at first, their own Catholic community as in a mission country, since it had been proven that such converts could not fit into the existing parochial community without losing both their class and their power to reach their companions and to transform their environment. Sometimes indeed, they could not fit into the existing parochial life at all, and then their Christianity did not long survive. In the early days of the J.O.C., a shrewd Jocist propagandist, Paul Hibout, had put the difficulty to the then auxiliary bishop of Versailles, "We are ready for to-morrow. Are you ready for the day after to-morrow?" Fathers Godin and Daniel, and many others, had found by many sad experiences that they were not ready. One of these, the most tragic perhaps of all, and the most perfectly related, is worth repeating even in an abbreviated form.

> A dozen militants meet in the little room of one of them, F——, on the eighth floor. . . . How many young fellows they succeeded in lifting out of the dirt and putting on their feet! "We are not a real Jocist section," they used to say, "we are only a friendship group." But they were real Christians. . . . They spoke of Christ at their meetings as they would of a big brother; they spoke of Christ at their work. . . . The Holy Spirit was visibly working in them. . . . It was chaotic and disconcerting: they brought all the sympathizers to Mass; it was for them a kind of manifestation. All who had made their first Communion approached the holy table. They knew that they were receiving Christ and they prayed with the artless simplicity of first communicants. . . .

A whole segment of the boys of a working-class neighborhood (and indirectly a segment of the girls) was contacted and came to know Christ in a warm atmosphere of self-giving. They did not become saints right away. They fell often, but they rose again in a complete dedication to Christ, and a dedication which seemed to include an act of perfect contrition, with all kinds of generous resolutions. . . . We think it is no exaggeration to say that we were witnesses of spiritual gifts, of real charisms. . . . But it could not go on this way forever. These boys had to be attached to the parish sooner or later. A priest who was zealous, but had always worked with the *bourgeoisie,* was given to them as chaplain. For lack of a more suitable place, it was proposed that they should meet in the sacristy, in the richly furnished room used for weddings. [Embarrassed for various reasons at the prospect] not one attended the new meetings. They continued to meet as before. But since the section was now a dissident one, the federation had to abandon it, and it soon broke up. . . . The boys continued to go to Mass for a time, some of them still continue to love Christ, and to pray to him, but *since no Christian community has accepted them, they are living in a kind of vague Protestantism.* F—— was a simple youth, but very deep. He spoke rarely, but he meant what he said with all his soul. Unfortunate from childhood, after he joined the J.O.C. he began to save a little with the idea of a home in mind (before that, everything went to the section), and he seemed on the road to a little happiness. He loved his fiancée intensely, and entrusted all his money to her. But she was not serious and consumed all his substance with another. F—— was brokenhearted. He continued to see a priest, but this time he made his arrangements directly with Christ; *he had no community of friends, and he was not strong enough to live a Christian life by himself.* One evening, he wrote on his retreat notebook, "My Christ, I am sorry. I am going to you," and turned on the gas as he lay down. . . . He was found a week later, for he lived all alone on the eighth floor.

Fr. Godin, in stressing the powerlessness of the parish, especially the parish as he knew it in the working-class sections of Paris, to deal with the problem of the conquest of the masses, knew that he was treading on dangerous ground. He wrote on a copy of the book for an old pastor of Saint-Claude, "Your big boy humbly excuses himself for thus causing scandals". . . . The pastor replied, "The good Lord is calling you in that direction. But there is one thing with which you must always keep in order: the Church. My child, your book enchanted me." Fr. Godin really did his best to avoid scandal, and he frequently insists in the book that he is discussing not what the parish should do and is not doing, but what the parish should not be expected to do and what it cannot do, that is, to conquer the masses and, at the beginning, assimilate them. The authors were looking only for the truth and "the truth is not against anything, it is." Is the problem then an insoluble one? In March of 1943, six months before the publication of the book, Fr. Godin had prepared a *Report on the Christian Conquest in the Proletarian* milieux, in which he outlined a plan by which the leaven could be put in every portion of the dough of humanity.

The grandchildren of John and Suzette perhaps will be the ones to effect an *entente cordiale.* The solution, in any case, lay in allowing the new converts to form their own Christian communities. But for that priests would be needed. The Mission of France at Lisieux approved the plan and the ideas. Cardinal Suhard, who had already spoken with Fr. Godin on the matter, gave it warm encouragement. "Doubtless," the Cardinal told him, "we must keep things in their place: the parish is indispensable, but it needs to be completed by a mission." The work was to be a real missionary venture. The Church herself, in quite a new way, was to be incarnated in the urban proletariat. A group of priests would begin the work as soon as possible in all parts of the diocese, and it would be a community work. The Mission of France agreed to supply priests in future to keep the work going. The official foundation day was July 1, the place being the Cardinal's residence. It received the name, the Mission of Paris, on Sept. 16.

The actual beginning, originally set for October, was postponed for various reasons, one of them the search for a superior, who, according to Fr. Godin, must be a pastor of the diocese of Paris. The Cardinal gave him a free hand in the matter, and he finally prevailed on Abbé Holland, pastor of Sainte-Anne de Polangis, to accept the responsibility. It was finally decided that the group should spend the period between Dec. 19 and Jan. 15 preparing together, in retreat and study, for the new enterprise. The first eight days were spent at Combs-la-Ville, the rest of the period at the seminary of the Mission of France at Lisieux. Everyone was struck by the atmosphere of faith and charity, and especially by the radiant light-heartedness of Fr. Godin, who took an extremely active part in the proceedings.

> The Abbé Godin is the animator of the proceedings, the thinker of the spirituality. With an ease which was a surprise to us all, he enters into discussions with the specialists he himself had invited, he sets his own experiences and his plans before us, he forms the common spirit. The Abbé is happy, and he never stops saying, "Everything is moving now, I can disappear."

Such is the testimony of one who took part in the session at Lisieux.

The Cardinal made the trip from Paris to be with the group on Jan. 13 and 14. He told them:

> The direct end of the Mission of Paris is to convert pagans. Its indirect end is to show the Christian community that it must adopt a new attitude. A shock is needed. Much has been done these last fifteen years, especially with Catholic Action; we must go further, and the Mission must show the way.
>
> Therefore: cultivate truth, modesty, humility, and respect for every good work; charity towards confreres; frankness towards the Christian community so that it may understand that it ought to be the one that does the converting. Put a healthy dissatisfaction in the souls of Christians.

It was decided to make the departure a solemn one. The group spent the late evening of Friday together in the basilica before the Blessed Sacrament. They had the Stations of the Cross in the basilica, followed by a midnight Mass in the seminary chapel, a votive Mass of Our Lady of Victory, at Fr. Godin's request. At the offertory each of the priests of the Mission of Paris made the promise composed by Father Godin: "Before the Virgin Mary, according to the judgment of the group (*équipe*), and during the time I belong to the Mission, I pledge myself by oath to consecrate my whole life to the Christianization of the working class of Paris." The whole group left for Paris Saturday evening, Jan. 15. They were all to be at their posts on Monday morning.

Fr. Godin preached a recollection to his *jeunes foyers* on Sunday. That evening he said to a confrere who was then sharing his apartment, "It is a miracle that everything turned out so well; from now on I can disappear; the Mission can do without me." The next morning Fr. Godin did not appear at the usual time, but the young man who was temporarily sleeping in the next room, thinking that the priest was simply tired out, was not at first alarmed. But about a quarter to eight, he thought that he smelled something burning. The door was hot and it was locked. A locksmith was brought to open it. The smoke poured out. They found, when they could eventually brave the smoke, that the foot of the bed, near the door, was burning slowly. Fr. Godin was dead, his feet quite charred. The doctor said that he had died of asphyxiation from the fumes of the coal stove which had recently replaced his gas heater. He had been too overcome by the fumes of the stove to be aroused by the heat when the bed took fire.

The news of the tragedy did not take long to spread, striking many hearts with dismay and bewilderment at first, but in the end arousing hope and confidence. The Cardinal gave permission for Mass to be celebrated in the room near the body. Monday night, the Jocists of Paris-Nord watched beside the body. Tuesday night it was the members of the Mission of Paris, the Cardinal himself making it a point to be with them and to tell them the hopes that filled him not in spite of, but because of, this providential sign.

On Wednesday night it was the turn of the J.O.C.F. of Vincennes, on Thursday, of the *jeunes foyers*. People were in line almost all the daylight hours, and at off-work periods there were near-crowds. The funeral took place on Friday at Saint-Michel des Batignolles, Fr. Godin's adopted parish. Abbé Guérin celebrated the Mass, while Abbé Michonneau directed the prayers. There were unforgettable moments at the Memento of the Dead, when the three groups, the J.O.C., the J.O.C.F., and the young homes and the fiancés, separately spoke their sorrow directly to Christ, and prayed "for him we loved so much and whom you have taken."

Of the two thousand workers present, five hundred received Communion, although it was then a half hour past noon and they would have to go back to work without eating. The crowd sang the customary farewell songs during the absolution.

The burial took place in the Parisian cemetery at Pantin, the cemetery of the proletariat. His body was to rest with the poor. His restless spirit would rest too, knowing that the poor of Paris would have the Gospel preached to them.

The reader will have noticed the extraordinary influence that devotion to the Blessed Virgin played in the apostolate of Fr. Godin. It is in this aspect of his life that he best corresponds to the description of St. Grignion de Montfort's apostles of the future. The Blessed Virgin has always been, of course, the Queen of Apostles, but it seems that her place in the fostering or inspiring of the apostolate is coming to be realized in our day as never before. In the life of Fr. Godin, the Blessed Virgin is so closely bound up with his apostolic vocation and work that, if we removed her, there would be very little left. Here surely we have an instance of a salutary development, of a revelation of a new beauty in the Church and of a new and mighty source of apostolic energy and initiative. Fr. Godin had adopted as a motto in Lille: *Toujours elle, beaucoup d'âmes, et quand même.* She had always been in his mind and his work, they had won many souls, and he had never counted the cost.

He had placed himself and his priesthood under Mary's protection from his earliest days. She too, though a descendant of kings, was of the people. He loved to think of her as the beautiful, gentle shepherdess looking after the good sheep (the devout souls attached to the parish), and himself as an ungainly, shaggy, somewhat stupid sheep dog running around, barking all the time, ceaselessly busy rounding up the sheep that had gone astray on the hills and in the forests. But she was to come to his aid when he was not succeeding. Before his subdiaconate, remembering that Don Bosco had asked the Blessed Virgin for a thousand places in heaven and that she made no difficulty about it, he had concluded that Don Bosco had not put the figure high enough. He asked for ten thousand places, and for himself a small space on the ground near the Virgin herself. Surely she reserved it for him.

JOHN F. MCCONNELL, M.M.

Maryknoll, N. Y.

THE CHURCH AND TEMPORAL RULERS

We do not place our trust in men, but, in so far as we are able, we warn men to put their trust in the Lord. Nor do we place our confidence in princes, but, in so far as we are able, we exhort princes to place their trust in the Lord. And, though we may seek aid from princes to promote the good of the Church, still we do not place our trust in them.

—St. Augustine, in his *Contra epistolam Parmeniani,* Book II, n. 224.

THE ORDEAL OF FATHER WALL

PART II

At his desk the Bishop sat pondering the documents in the file relating to Fr. Wall. This trouble which seemed to be brewing in the parish in Jordan would have to be handled carefully. There was considerable resentment apparent in the reports which he had received, and, perhaps, some of it was justified by the way the pastor had fired the janitor after the Bishop had visited and commented on the condition of the Church. There were, however, some further allegations going the rounds which called for a more extensive consideration. It was not going to be a simple case of recommending to Fr. Wall that he reinstate the man he had fired and thus cut off the talk in the parish.

On the other hand, it would not be a pleasant thing to step in and exercise his authority over Fr. Wall who was one of the older pastors in the diocese, one of the old war-horses who had carried for years the burden of building up the Church in this territory. He had piled up a lot of merit for himself over a long period of years, and it would be quite unfair to tear it all down with a hasty move against the old man.

A pastor, the Bishop recalled, was supposed to be of good moral character, learned, zealous for souls, prudent, and endowed with the other virtues and qualities which were required both by general and by particular laws for governing in praiseworthy fashion the parish to which he was assigned.[1] Nowhere in the file on Fr. Wall was there any suggestion that he did not have the required good moral character. As for his learning, he had done well in the examinations which he had taken while he was still numbered among the junior clergy;[2] and he was almost always present at the deanery conferences,[3] which in that particular district the priests were accustomed to hold every month throughout the year. If he was absent, now and then, it was because of sickness or some other equally valid reason. There was, therefore, hardly room for the application of the suggestion of the Council of Trent[4] regarding the appointment of a vicar where the pastor is unlearned or lacking in practical experience, though of good character, to take over the administration of the parish.

---

[1] Cf. Can. 453, §2.

[2] Cf. Can. 459, §3,2°; 130.

[3] Cf. Can. 131.

[4] Cf. Sess. XXI, *de ref.*, c. 6.

Learning, however, was not all that was required, as Benedict XIV observed[5] when he said that not without serious harm to souls and injury to discipline would one be placed in charge of a church who was more proficient in learning, but in other matters less fitted, and perhaps even unworthy, while another person was kept out who, though less learned, was a better man by reason of his good character, seriousness, prudence, good reputation, long service to the Church, and many claims to praise for his virtues.

In the matter of zeal for souls it seemed from the reports that of late years Fr. Wall was receding somewhat from that which he had shown as a young priest just out on the mission. True, he still had a rather large number of converts to his credit year after year; but there was basis for some question as to how much zeal he showed for those who were already members of his flock. This was a point that would bear further consideration. It might be that he was neglecting his people, and then again it might be that by now he knew them all so well that he could get around less and still keep his finger on the pulse of the parish. There were two ways of looking at it, and a hasty decision might be quite baseless in fact.

His prudence was somewhat open to question in the matter of the firing of the janitor on such a flimsy pretext. Ordinarily he had been a prudent administrator of the spiritual and temporal things of the parish—he had brought the parish through the Depression and finally paid off the debts, while at the same time keeping up the property and making necessary improvements. This affair of the janitor might be just a rare slip occasioned by too long and constant application without a sufficient break, or vacation, to enable him to keep his perspective. It was, nonetheless, something which was to be kept in mind in passing judgment on the allegations about him which had reached the Bishop.

As for the other virtues and qualities which any man should have to run the Jordan parish successfully there did not appear to be in the file any indication one way or the other. The Bishop who had appointed Fr. Wall to that parish, the predecessor of the present Bishop who was studying the file, had apparently considered that the pastor possessed those qualities and since there was nothing to show that he had lost them it must be presumed that he continued to possess them.

---

[5] Cf. Const. "*Cum illud,*" Dec. 14, 1742, §11; Docum. IV in C.J.C.

Should he remove Fr. Wall from the Jordan parish? He could do so, if necessary, of course, but the idea of the Church was that men who were appointed to administer a parish should be stable there, though this did not mean that they might not all be removed according to the procedure provided by law.[6] To comply with this procedure would mean a careful consideration of many things. The parish in Jordan was an "irremovable" parish, which could not be turned into a "removable" parish without consent of the Holy See, which consent had never been requested, and that in itself would call for a longer procedure than that required in case the parish were "removable."

There was in the file a record of a controversy Fr. Wall had once had with one of the other pastors of the diocese regarding a Baptism administered by the latter. Fr. Wall, however, had been in the right in that case, for the fact had been the child so baptized should have been presented to Fr. Wall for baptism. It was after all, to his parish that the child had belonged and he had had the right to baptize it.[7]

The Bishop's secretary came in to say that the pastor from Wheeler was waiting with a renewal note to be countersigned by the Bishop and that three other people were also waiting out in the ante-room. Interruptions, as usual, the prelate sighed to himself as he closed the Wall file and put it aside.

When the visitors had all been heard and the stack of letters which the secretary had brought in after they had departed had been disposed of, the Bishop reopened Fr. Wall's file. Where had he been? The Baptism matter, that was it. Did that mean that Fr. Wall was grasping as to stole-fees? Apparently, he was not for there was no indication of it in the file. He had accepted the fees offered according to the custom in the diocese, it seemed. At least the record did not show that he had ever demanded more than was allowed. There was no charge that he had ever refused to act without recompense when a poor person asked for his ministrations. There was no indication that he had held up any sacrament as a means to obtain payment of pew-rent, or the like.

There was indication of a rumor to the effect that he had taken the stole-fees even when others had done the work in the parish, but there was nothing to point to a gift over and above the amount of the fee intended for the one who had done it, so the pastor's right seemed not to be in dispute. There might be some question as to his liberality with brother-priests, but there was nothing illegal there to be held against Fr. Wall.[8] Perhaps he would have saved himself some embarrassment and kicks had he been more generous, but there was nothing in the Canons to compel him to behave differently than he had.

---

[6] Cf. Can. 454, §1.

[7] Cf. Can. 462,1°; 738, §1.

There was no charge that Fr. Wall had excluded any members of the parish from his ministrations. He was bound to take care of all of them,[9] since the Bishop had not exempted anyone in that parish from his care.[10]

After another interruption the Bishop continued to go through Fr. Wall's file. The record of his profession of Faith was in the dossier, so that formal pre-requisite to his taking possession of the Jordan parish had been complied with.[11] Everything had been done according to law in the naming of the man to that office.

As pastor Fr. Wall was obliged to reside in a rectory near his church.[12] The Bishop smiled, for the rectory in Jordan, as he recalled, was next door to the church, so that requirement of the law was fulfilled in Fr. Wall's case. There was no need to consider the matter of his being permitted to live at a distance, but still within such range that he could easily attend to the duties of the parish.

The question of absence from that rectory was one which would call for further investigation. According to the law[13] the pastor could be away for at most two months during the year, whether such absence was continous or interrupted, unless a grave reason, in the judgment of the Bishop, should either require a longer absence or permit only a shorter one. There was nothing in the file to show that any such judgment had ever been exercised, so the question would be whether the two-month rule had been observed by Fr. Wall.

The time of retreat would not be counted as absence, of course.[14] As far as the provisions on substitutes went, it seemed from the file that Fr. Wall had always been careful to get a substitute approved by the Bishop and written permission for his absence when he was to be gone for more than a week, for the permissions were all on file.[15] On one occasion, apparently, he had been called away suddenly when his sister died, but that had been duly explained by a letter to the former Bishop who had seen to it that a substitute was sent to Jordan to take the pastor's place.[16] Even when Fr. Wall was away for less than a week, it appeared from the statements of the parishioners who had brought the case of the pastor to the Bishop's attention that the priest from the neighboring parish took care of the needs of the faithful.[17] This was the common and not unreasonable practice of the priests in his diocese, he knew, and as a practical matter it resulted in care being taken of the sick-calls or other urgent matters which might arise. So long as the men did not abuse the system he had found, as yet, no reason to oppose it.

---

[8] Cf. Can. 463.

[9] Cf. Can. 464, §1.

[10] Cf. Can. 464, §2.

[11] Cf. Can. 461.

[12] Cf. Can. 465, §1.

[13] Cf. Can. 465, §2.

[14] Cf. Can. 465, §3.

The obligation of offering Mass for his parish had, apparently, been a matter of which Fr. Wall was very careful. He had asked the permission of the Bishop the few times when he needed to offer it on a different day than that established by law, and had offered it in the parish church himself, except when he was absent over Sunday or a holyday with permission.[18]

Another caller came and went before the Bishop was able to resume his study of the file on Fr. Wall. Mass he had considered, now what about holding of other services in the Jordan church? Fr. Wall had, it seemed, been careful to have all the services customary in a parish. He had even inaugurated the novena devotions which the people had wanted. He had not been too enthusiastic about that, the Bishop recalled, when he had come in to talk about the matter; but after the permission had been given and he had seemed happier the next time the Bishop had seen him.

He had administered the sacraments to the faithful, too, whenever they had asked him to do so, except for that one case which was being mentioned concerning his failure to come to administer the sacraments to that woman who was dying. That was a point which would need further investigation. The file showed nothing on that point, except for the recent statements which had started this whole study.

---

[15] Cf. Can. 465, §4.

[16] Cf. Can. 465, §5.

[17] Cf. Can. 465, §6.

[18] Cf. Can. 466.

He was apparently familiar with the problems of most, if not all, of his parishioners. He had been in the parish so long that he had baptized a great many of his flock and the others he had long known or had met within a short time after their arrival in the town or the surrounding country.[19] If there were any he did not know well they were probably among those who had moved in during the war to work in that plant in the town which had expanded when it received war-orders.

How careful he had been in correcting the faults of his parishioners might be something to investigate. There had been a story in the papers about a juvenile delinquent with a Catholic-sounding name who came from Jordan. It had been quite a case and had received considerable publicity, as the Bishop recalled. Perhaps Fr. Wall had never had anything to do with the lad, or perhaps he had tried unsuccessfully to do something; but the obligation to correct those who err might be something, too, which over the years had slipped his mind.[20] Then, too, getting older himself he might simply have lost any real touch with the teen-agers whose language he no longer spoke. They, in turn, might feel respect for the old priest, and still not feel that he would understand them and their problems if they did go to him.

There had not been many cases for the Diocesan Charities Office from Jordan. That might mean that the people there were able to get along on their own, or it might mean that they were getting what help they needed locally, possibly from Fr. Wall. It might also mean, of course, that he considered the Diocesan Charities a new-fangled idea which was quite useless. At any rate, there was nothing positive to show that he had not been doing his duty with regard to the poor and unfortunate in the parish, though that would be something to consider.[21]

There was a question raised in this recent information as to the sort of instruction which Fr. Wall was providing for the children of the parish. Of course, a lot of it was taken care of by the school which he had there and in which the children received their instructions. Most of the children of the parish attended the parish school, naturally, and thus their religious instruction was

[19] Cf. Can. 467, §1.

[20] Cf. *ibid.*

[21] Cf. *ibid.*

provided for. There was no exact information in the file, the Bishop thought regretfully, as to the steps Fr. Wall had taken to care for the instruction of those children who did not attend the parish school, either because they lived too far out in the country, or because they had permission to attend the public school in town. It would be a point to consider, how Fr. Wall arranged for the instruction of these children.[22]

So far as it appeared, Fr. Wall had taught his people well their obligation to have their children baptized as soon as possible, for there was no indication of infants dying without baptism in that parish.[23] The doctors, nurses, and faithful, apparently, had been instructed as to the proper form of baptism so that they would be able to take care of the situation should need arise when Fr. Wall would be unable to get there in time to perform the ceremony.[24]

From the report on the inspection of the baptismal records in the parish at the time of the last visitation the Bishop recalled that the provision of the Canons[25] as to the choice of a Christian name had been complied with in the Jordan parish. Fr. Wall was obviously a serious and careful shepherd on these points regarding Baptism.

Confirmations were held in the parish regularly and there were always quite a few adults alongside the children. The Bishop recalled, too, that Fr. Wall had seen to it that adults, other than converts, who had moved into his parish and who had never been confirmed were on hand to receive the sacrament when the Bishop came. That spoke well for his solicitude for his flock and his familiarity with their spiritual needs.[26]

Another visitor took up more of the Bishop's time before he was able to take up the dossier once more, and then a telephone call interrupted him for still another several minutes. Turning his thoughts back to the problem of Fr. Wall the prelate began to check his actions in the matter of admitting children to make their First Holy Communion. Apparently the pastor had seen to it that the children did not receive It before they were old enough to understand. The Sisters in the school took care of most of the work of instructing the children for this. Fr. Wall dropped in from time to time with his usual present of candy or a holy picture for the children who knew their lesson best. The Bishop was sure that the children were well instructed before they received Holy Communion for the first time. There was likewise no indication that the children were allowed to go for long without receiving It after they were old enough and had been instructed.[27]

---

[22] Cf. *ibid.*

[23] Cf. Can. 770.

[24] Cf. Can. 743.

[25] Cf. Can. 761.

[26] Cf. Can. 787.

There was no record in the file as to whether or not Fr. Wall was a member of the Priests' Communion League and thus had bound himself to promote frequent and daily communion among the faithful, but it appeared that communions were frequent in the parish. The fact that there was not always Mass in the parish church on week-days tended to keep the faithful from acquiring the habit of daily communion, but whether they would have acquired it with daily Mass was something that could not be decided without a consideration of the exigencies of their work and their other circumstances.[28]

The Bishop tapped thoughtfully on the desk with his pencil. The case was not shaping up to anything so far. Should he pay attention to the complaints which had been made, or should he consider that Fr. Wall was a good, if sometimes crotchety, man and let it drop? Perhaps a further consideration of the duties of pastors would shed some light on the problem.

The pastor, of course, had a grave obligation in justice to hear the confessions of his parishioners or at least see that they were heard as often as they reasonably asked.[29] Fr. Wall, however, seemed to have been on hand at the times announced for the hearing of confessions every Saturday afternoon and evening and before the holydays. There was, at least, no complaint in the files to the effect that he had not been on hand to hear the confessions at the announced times. When he had had permission to be absent the substitute had taken care of the obligation. Even in the fall when he had gone to a football game there had been someone else there to hear the confessions in his place, so his obligation in justice had been taken care of.

There was, of course, that charge that he had failed to come in response to a call to the death-bed of that old lady. That seemed to show a violation of Canon 468, §1 which required him to assist the sick in his parish, especially those near death, with sedulous care and fullest charity, solicitously furnishing them with the sacraments and recommending their souls to God. From the way the canon was worded this looked like a very serious obligation and it would be necessary to investigate all the circumstances of his failure to come to that death-bed when called. The Bishop made a note of this. In fact, if Fr. Wall was guilty of failure to perfom this duty he had not only disobeyed the canon but had violated the virtue of justice. The lady was a parishioner, but the obligation would have been the same had she been a member of a lay religious order which the pastor was bound to look after.[30]

---

[27] Cf. Can. 854, §5.

[28] Cf. Can. 863.

[29] Cf. Can. 939.

The Bishop wondered what excuse the pastor could give for his failure in this matter. There might be some good excuse, so it would be wise to withhold judgment until the pastor had had an opportunity to be heard. He turned again to the file and continued his investigation.

There was nothing there to show that a request had ever been sent to Fr. Wall to make the required publications before ordination of a boy from the parish.[31] The Bishop pondered a moment whether Fr. Wall had been doing much to foster vocations from Jordan, and then remembered that there had been one or two boys from that parish in the seminary who had not continued their studies. That explained why there was no record in the files of testimonial letters regarding the morals and life of those to be ordained from the parish.[32]

As to the ante-nuptial investigation,[33] the Bishop knew that all pastors in the diocese had been furnished with the forms required by the instruction. Flicking the switch of the intercommunication system he called the Chancellor, who told him that while at times there had been some delay in getting information from Fr. Wall for transmission to another diocese he had always in the end come through with the required information.

Whether the pastor had been equally careful about the investigations in cases of marriages performed in his own parish would have to be discovered by checking the files in the rectory where the documents relating to marriages performed in the parish were kept. The Bishop made a note to check on this to see whether Fr. Wall himself had made the investigation in the case of every marriage, even when he was morally certain there was no impediment, as required by the instruction. It would be a good idea, too, to check whether he had made it a suitable time before celebration of the marriage, and whether he had covered all the circumstances that might in any way be an obstacle to the marriage. Of course, if he followed the form prescribed for the diocese he would have been certain to cover the various circumstances. That was why it had turned out to be so long when the Chancery Office had finished preparing it.

---

[30] Cf. Can. 514, §3.

[31] Cf. Can. 998, §1.

[32] Cf. Can. 1000, §1.

[33] Cf. Can. 1019-1031; Instruction on the Rules to be Observed by the Pastor in Conducting the Canonical Investigations Before Admitting the Parties to the Celebration of Marriage—S.C. Sacr., June 29, 1941—*AAS* vol. 33, p. 297.

The Bishop decided he would have to check, too, on whether Fr. Wall had always secured recent legal certificates of baptism with all pertinent notations, or at least found out from the pastor of the place from which the parties came that there was no record of baptism of such parties and then secured the proper dispensations for the marriage. He would have to check, also, on Fr. Wall's investigation as to the parish or parishes in which the celebration of the marriage had to be recorded, and as to whether the parties were of age or were minors. It would be wise to find out, likewise, whether Fr. Wall had always been careful to learn whether both parties were Catholics, or one or both non-Catholics, but bound to the canonical form according to canon 1099. He would, in addition, have to see what care Fr. Wall had used in the case of those who had been married before but now asserted that the former spouse was dead, or that the previous marriage had been declared null, or had been dispensed as not consummated, and whether he had obtained the required legal documents as proof of their assertions in such cases.

The manner, too, in which Fr. Wall had conducted the investigation would be a matter for consideration. Whether he had interrogated the parties separately and cautiously, i.e. distinctly, separately, and with modesty, due prudence and circumspection, especially when asking about impediments and other circumstances which might suggest infamy or shame, would be something to be learned.

If Fr. Wall had followed the official form for the diocese in this matter he must have covered all the impediments. The Bishop wondered, however, how careful the pastor had been on the matter of consanguinity. Had he always made up the genealogical tree to determine the relationship? Perhaps he had never had occasion to do it; but, considering the way the instruction was worded, it would be a good idea to investigate this point, too.

The Bishop reflected that from Fr. Wall's parish, as from the others in the diocese, requests had come in for dispensations from major impediments, as he read in the instruction that for validity there is required a reason which is canonical, that is, just, in proportion to the gravity of the impediment, and actually existing. He noted further that before the execution of the rescript of dispensation it must be certain that the reason actually exists, else there is danger that the dispensation will be invalid. Had Fr. Wall been careful in this matter, or had he merely looked at the list of grounds for dispensation on the back of the blank and checked a handy one? Perhaps a look at his past requests for dispensations was in order. Would it show a careless sameness, or would the variety of grounds proposed show a reasonable attempt to suit the statement to the case? The Chancellor, called on the inter-office telephone, said he would start checking immediately.

The instruction also spoke about the pastors' duty to instruct the people about both impedient and diriment impediments to marriage.[34] The Bishop was well aware that for lack of some other topic marriage was frequently discussed; but was that discussion such that the people got a clear and comprehensive understanding of the nature of the sacrament and of the impediments thereto? If so, why was there so much wonderment and talk when a decree of nullity was handed down? Perhaps it would be a good idea to find out from the people what kind of ideas Fr. Wall and the other pastors in the diocese had conveyed to them in their talks on marraige. The Church considered the matter of this instruction important. Had it been handled properly in the diocese?

Remembering the actions of another pastor in the diocese with regard to persons who came and explained to him that they had been married before but that that marriage was invalid, the Bishop wondered whether Fr. Wall had always been careful to see to it that the nullity of the previous marriage was established by strictly canonical proof, observing the judicial procedure until a second concordant judgment against the validity of the marriage, from which no appeal was taken by the defender of the bond; or according to the rules in the so-called exceptional cases. Had he, on the other hand, presumed to say that from the story the parties told it was obvious that they were free to marry and then proceeded to perform the ceremony? The instruction pointed out that pastors should be very careful that, whether in good or bad faith, marriage be not contracted anew contrary to law by persons who were held by the bond of a former marriage, even though there was serious doubt as to its validity, nay even though it was certainly invalid.

---

[34] Cf. Can. 1018.

The instruction also started the Bishop wondering how many of the questionnaires in Fr. Wall's file would show a mere "Yes" in answer to the question whether the parties were entering the marriage of their own free will. Had he used the particular care required by the instruction when the parties were induced to marry in order to ward off some danger, especially to avoid penalties to which they would otherwise be subject from the civil law? Had he sought information, as the instruction suggested, as to the opinion of others regarding the freedom of the parties' consent? "Shot-gun" marriages could still occur in this day and age, the Bishop reflected.

The Bishop's secretary interrupted to remind him that they had to go to Westmount that afternoon for a Confirmation. The Bishop looked at his watch and decided he had time for just a few more considerations before lunch.

How thorough had been Fr. Wall's investigation of the knowledge of Christian Doctrine on the part of those who sought to contract marriage? Had he merely assumed that a few years of Catechism and Religion in school gave them all the answers, or had he tried to find out what they really knew and then carefully instruct them as to things they would have to know if theirs was to be a successful Christian marriage?

Had he really discovered whether the parties were attaching to their marriage contract conditions which would prevent it from being a valid marriage? What had he done about it when he had discovered such conditions?

Whether or not Fr. Wall had properly recorded all mariages of people baptized in the Jordan parish in the baptismal register there would have to be discovered by checking those books. The Bishop made a note to have that done, too. The regular annual report from the Dean of the district in which Jordan was situated showed that the books were all in order. The Dean had checked particularly, as required by the instruction, those of marriage and baptism, so it was probable that they were all in order. In any event, the Bishop would be able to check each individual entry the more readily since the Dean had already seen them all.

The Bishop noted, also, that the instruction said he should not fail to inflict upon negligent pastors, especially upon habitual offenders, canonical penalties in accordance with Canon 2222, §1, including suspension *a divinis*, so that all danger of transgression might be removed and the proper celebration of marriages might be effectively safeguarded as becomes the dignity and sanctity of the sacrament of matrimony.

To the secretary who came to remind him that the hour was growing late the Bishop handed Fr. Wall's file with instructions to put it away where he would be able to continue his study of it at the earliest opportunity.

* * * * *

Fr. Wall shivered and looked out the window at the school. Where was that numb-skull janitor he had got to replace Faber? Didn't know how to keep a decent fire. Of course the furnace was old and cranky, but Faber had always known how to keep it going properly. He hadn't thought about that when he fired the man. He wondered what Faber was doing now. Maybe he could get him back. He'd have to offer him a raise, of course, and it would be giving in to the man. He shivered again.

Still, a man ought to be sensible about these things. Pride could not keep a man warm. He went to the telephone and began trying to find Faber.

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE THEOLOGICAL PROOF FOR THE NECESSITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

PART I

It is a commonplace among teachers of scholastic theology that the thesis on the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation is one of the most difficult to impart accurately and effectively. Part of this difficulty is inherent in the subject itself, since the necessity of the Church is one of the basic aspects of its character as God's supernatural kingdom on earth. Thus this truth properly belongs to the central mystery of God's dispensation to His adopted children. In some measure, however, this difficulty stems from the fact that students are affected by certain fairly widespread but utterly untheological presentations of the doctrine on the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation. Unfortunately, some presentations of this dogma are obviously attempts to explain it away, rather than objectively to explain its meaning.

The intolerably bad effects of this untheological teaching can best be obviated by the use of the genuine theological demonstration of the Church's necessity for salvation. The true theology of the "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" must not and cannot detract from the mystery of the Church itself. Yet it is certainly capable of showing up as unfounded a kind of tepid and unrealistic attitude towards Christian life which neglect or misinterpretation of the dogma about the Church's necessity is wont to generate. And, because the complete theological demonstration of this thesis is very seldom set forth in the modern literature of scholastic theology, the present article will attempt to outline what is manifestly one of the most urgently needed sections of the sacred doctrine.

Any theological demonstration is the certain and complete proof that a given statement or thesis actually forms a part of the deposit of divine public revelation which Our Lord committed to the Church in which He dwells and which the Church guards and teaches infallibly until the end of time by the power of the Holy Ghost. It begins with an accurate statement of the thesis or conclusion, drawn from the pertinent datum of positive theology. It then analyzes this statement, and situates the component concepts against their proper background in the field of revealed truth. Thus, in one and the same process, the pertinence of the thesis to the original deposit of divine revelation is manifested and the full meaning of this thesis as an expression of Christian truth is set forth. Such actually is and must be the proper theological treatment of the proposition that the Catholic Church is really necessary for eternal salvation.

The first and in some ways the most important step in the fashioning of this theological proof must be the accurate statement of the proposition with which we are concerned. The immediate norm of divine faith is the teaching of the Catholic Church itself. Hence, any theological demonstration should begin with an examination of the various authentic declarations of the Church on the subject under discussion. Only thus can we arrive at an accurate presentation of the truth which the theological demonstration is meant to prove and to elucidate.

As a prelude to the work of consulting and listing the authentic ecclesiastical pronouncements on the necessity of the Church for salvation, however, we should notice the various forms which modern theologians and writers on theological subjects have given to their theses on this subject. Basically modern teaching on this point can be reduced to six formulae. The correctness and the adequacy of each one of these six formulae can, of course, only be determined by a process of comparison with the official statements of the Church itself.

(A) The visible Catholic Church is sometimes said to be necessary for salvation with the necessity of precept alone.

(B) Occasionally the visible Catholic Church is described as necessary for salvation with the necessity of means, but only as the *ordinary* means of salvation.

(C) One method of explaining the Church's necessity for salvation is to hold that all this teaching involves is an affirmation of the fact that the various divine gifts which prepare for and constitute salvation actually belong to the visible Catholic Church.

(D) Another and a hitherto rather popular method of explaining this teaching has been to hold that no man can enter heaven without having been at least a member of the soul of the Church on earth at the time of death.

(E) Some writers have held that, in order to be saved, a man must actually be a member of the visible Church.

(F) The traditional scholastic expression of the thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation is the statement that, in order to be saved, a man must, at the moment of his death, either be a member of the visible Catholic Church or sincerely desire to become a member.

These six basic formulae frequently appear in combination with one another. Thus Edouard Hugon's explanation of the Church's necessity for salvation employs the first, the fourth, and the sixth among them. The great Dominican professor of the Angelico distinquished between the *necessity* of belonging to the soul of the Church and the *obligation* of belonging to its body. He taught that the axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" signifies that there is a "necessity of means to belong to the soul of the Church, not merely by desire but actually, and to belong at least by desire to the body of the Church, and to belong to the body of the Church in reality in the measure in which one knows it and is able to perform this duty."[1] Rejecting as inadequate any explanations based on "good faith," on a soul of the Church, on an invisible Church, or on a mere necessity of precept, the illustrious French Jesuit Jean Vincent Bainvel combines the second, the fifth, and the sixth of our formulae in his teaching. He holds that the Church is the ordinary means of salvation, and that all of those who are saved are members of the Church, even though they enter it only by desire.[2]

The German writer, Dr. Karl Adam, employs the second, the third, and the fourth of our formulae in the following passage from his *The Spirit of Catholicism.*

> True there is only one Church of Christ. She alone is the Body of Christ and without her there is no salvation. Objectively and practically considered she is the ordinary way of salvation, the single and exclusive channel by which the truth and grace of Christ enter our world of space and time. But those also who know her not receive these gifts from her; yes, even those who misjudge and fight against her, provided they are in good faith, and are simply and loyally seeking the truth without self-righteous obstinacy. Though it be not the Catholic Church

---

[1] *Hors de l'église point de salut* (Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1927), p. 364.

[2] Cf. *Is There Salvation Outside the Catholic Church?* translated by Fr. Weidenhan (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1920), pp. 25 ff.

itself which hands them the bread of truth and grace, yet it is Catholic bread that they eat. And, while they eat of it, they are, without knowing it or willing it, incorporated in the supernatural substance of the Church. Though they be outwardly separated from the Church, they belong to its soul.[3]

There are numerous doctrinal pronouncements on the Church's necessity for salvation, as we can readily see from an examination of the text of Cavallera's *Thesaurus doctrinae catholicae* or the index of Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum*. If we examine a selected five of these texts, however, we shall find in them all of the basic truths which the Church has proclaimed about its own necessity. The first of these five passages is to be found in the first chapter of the Fourth Council of the Lateran. The second occurs in the Bull, *Unam sanctam*, written by Pope Boniface VIII. The third is in the Decree for the Jacobites, issued by the Oecumenical Council of Florence. The fourth is in the allocution *Singulari quadam*, given by Pope Pius IX, while the fifth and last is to be found in that same Pontiff's encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore*.

The Fourth Lateran Council teaches that "there is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved."[4] It is important to note that the expression "*fidelium universalis Ecclesia*," employed by this Oecumenical Council, is exactly the equivalent of the formula "*catholicorum collectio*," which Gratian's *Decretum* attributed to Pope Nicholas.[5] In the language of the Church the *fidelis* is and has always been the Catholic, the full-fledged member of the true Church of Jesus Christ. An ecclesiastical document like the so-called seventh canon of the second Oecumenical Council could qualify the catechumen as a Christian.[6] The title of *fidelis*, however, was always reserved for the baptized person fully joined to Our Lord's society by its external bonds of unity.

It is thus the visible Catholic Church, the society formed by the

---

[3] *The Spirit of Catholicism*, translated by Dom Justin McCann, O.S.B.; (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), p. 175.

[4] Cap. 1, cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1937), n. 430.

[5] C. 8, D. I, "de cons."

[6] Cf. Hefele-Leclerq, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908), II, 38 ff.

Catholics or the *fideles* throughout the world, which the Council describes as so requisite for salvation that outside of it no one at all is saved (*extra quam nullus omnino salvatur*). In consequence, the teaching which holds the Church to be the "ordinary" means of salvation can never be accepted as an explanation of the truth proposed in this statement. If the Church were actually and merely the "ordinary" means of salvation, the Council would have been decidedly in error in stating that outside of that Church "no one at all (*nullus omnino*)" would be saved. Moreover the teaching that the visible Church is requisite for salvation only with the necessity of precept must also be rejected in the light of the Lateran Council's pronouncement. A thing which is necessary *only* by the necessity of precept is incumbent only upon those to whom the promulgation of the precept has come. The fact that the Fourth Lateran declared the visible Catholic and Roman Church to be necessary in such a way that outside of it no one at all would be saved is clear indication that this assembly did not consider the Church as requisite merely with the necessity of precept.

In his Bull, the *Unam sanctam*, issued Nov. 18, 1302, Pope Boniface VIII taught that "at the bidding of faith, we are compelled to believe and to hold the one holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church. We firmly believe and unfeignedly proclaim this [Church], outside of which there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins."[7] This document ends with the statement: "Therefore we declare, say, define, and pronounce that for every human creature, to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is absolutely necessary for salvation (*omnino de necessitate salutis*)."[8]

The *Unam sanctam* speaks in such a way as to reject the notion that the Catholic Church is requisite for salvation merely with the necessity of precept or merely as an ordinary means. Its main importance in this section of sacred theology, however, is to be found in the fact that it also excludes any serious attempt to explain the Church's necessity by saying that the axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" means only that the graces leading to salvation belong to the Church or that a kind of pertinence to "the soul of the Church" in this world is sufficient for eternal salvation. According to this pronouncement of Pope Boniface

---

[7] *DB*, 468.

[8] *DB*, 469.

VIII, a man must be subject in some way to the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth and the visible head of the Catholic Church, in order to enjoy everlasting life. Unequivocally, then, the *Unam sanctam* holds that a man must be in some manner attached to the visible Catholic Church in this world if he is to be in the number of the blessed in heaven. Thus not only is it true that the *salus* belongs to the Church Catholic, but that the man who will attain it must also be counted among those who have in some way joined its company.

It is, of course, impossible to make any rational or accurate use of the term "soul of the Church" in explaining the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salvation. Current theological literature tells us of three ways of explaining the meaning of this expression. First of all there is the perfectly acceptable doctrine which expresses the function of the indwelling Holy Ghost in the Catholic Church by speaking of Him as the Soul of this society. If, utilizing this terminology, we state that, in order to be saved, a man has to belong to the Soul of the Church or be a member of the Soul of the Church we either fail to attempt an explanation of the very thesis under discussion or we indulge in mere gibberish. If the formula means that a man must have the Holy Ghost dwelling within him in the life of sanctifying grace in order that he may attain to the beatific vision, then this teaching is perfectly correct, but it fails to explain the function of the visible Catholic Church with reference to salvation. If, on the other hand, it means that in some way we are to become "members" of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity in order to be saved, then it is reduced to mere unintelligibility.

Secondly there is the teaching which identifies the soul of the Church with sanctifying grace and with the various infused graces, both theological and moral, that belong with it. When this doctrine is employed in teaching that pertinence to the soul of the Church is requisite for salvation, there is not even an attempt to account for the teaching contained in the *Unam sanctam.* There is no question whatsoever about the fact that grace and the various infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost are requisite for salvation. The thing that theology is bound to explain is the function of the Church with reference to salvation and to the acquisition of these other supernatural gifts, since, according to Pope Boniface, there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins (to be found only in justification, or the infusion of sanctifying grace together with its attendant supernatural habits) outside of the Church.

Thirdly there was the notion that the soul of the Church was some kind of an invisible society of the just, a company of those in the state of grace even outside the confines of the visible Catholic Church. Prior to the appearance of the encyclical *Mystici corporis* there were a good many Catholic writers and lecturers who attempted to explain the necessity of the Church in terms of this fictitious assembly, asserting that, in order to be saved, a man had at least to be a member of this invisible society. The appearance of the *Mystici corporis*, officially denying the existence of such an invisible society or Church, has been an unquestionable blessing for the Church of God in our times.

The central truth or mystery of Christ's dealings with the children of men consists in the fact that His company is actually the visible Catholic Church, an organization within which good members and bad members will be mingled together until the end of time. The divine teaching on the necessity of the *ecclesia* for man's salvation has reference to the fact that, in order to obtain the Beatific Vision, a man must be connected in some way or other with this definite and visible organization. The *Unam sanctam* shows that it is impossible to explain the divine doctrine about the Church's necessity by teaching merely that the gifts of God which prepare for and constitute salvation belong to the visible Church. It insists that, in order to be saved, each man must in some manner be subject to the Roman Pontiff, the vicar of Christ on earth and the visible head of His Church.

Furthermore, in his *Unam sanctam*, Pope Boniface VIII taught that the Church is requisite not only for salvation but for the remission of sins. Now the remission of sins takes place only in and through the process of justification. As a matter of fact, it is what might be called the negative aspect of this process. The state of sin is a condition of aversion from God. It is the voluntary privation of the life of sanctifying grace in an intellectual creature meant by God to possess that supernatural life.

Hence the removal or remission of sin (original or actual) consists in the conversion of the man to God. In this process the sin is remitted in and through the supernatural conversion of the man to God in the life of sanctifying grace. For every man who comes into the world as a member of the family of Adam, the infusion of *gratia prima* involves the remission of sin. Furthermore sin can be remitted only in the process of conversion to God. Since the only conversion towards God possible for man is the supernatural life of sanctifying grace, there is no remission of original or mortal sin without the infusion of this supernatural life. According to the Catholic dogma, brought out in the *Unam sanctam*, the Church is requisite for eternal salvation in exactly the same measure that it is necessary for this infusion of the *gratia prima* or for the remission of sin.

The *Decree for the Jacobites*, issued by the Oecumenical Council of Florence, enlarges upon this concept. Insisting that the visible Church is necessary for all men, in so far as those who are not attached to it at the end of their lives will never attain to the Beatific Vision, the *Decree* teaches also that those works which would be highly meritorious if performed under the direction of Christian charity will be of no value when performed by a person who is outside the Church in such a way as to be turned away from his salvation. The man who is not "within the Church" as he must be in order to be eligible for the Beatific Vision will not find the works of Christian piety or even the reception of the Christian sacraments profitable for him unto salvation. The Council's teaching on the necessity of the Catholic Church is found in the following paragraph.

> It [the sacrosanct Roman Church, established by the voice of Our Lord and Saviour] firmly believes, professes, and teaches that none of those who do not exist within the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but Jews, heretics, and schismatics, can become partakers of eternal life; but that they are going to the everlasting fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels, unless they become attached to it (*nisi . . . eidem fuerint aggregati*) before they die. And [it firmly believes, professes and teaches] that the unity of the ecclesiastical body is of such value that the ecclesiastical sacraments are profitable unto salvation, and that fastings, almsgivings, and the other duties of piety and exercises of the Christian combat bring forth eternal rewards only for those who remain within it: and that, however great his almsgiving, and even though he might shed his blood for the name of Christ, no one can be saved unless he remains in the embrace and in the unity of the Catholic Church.[9]

---

[9] *DB*, 714. The teaching on the necessity of the Church for the remission of sins is that of St. Augustine, in his *Enchiridion*, cap. 65, and in *Sermone*

During the earlier history of Christianity there was never anything like a concerted effort to explain away the necessity of the Church for salvation. Hence the Pontifical and Conciliar documents to which we have referred thus far dealt with what was, for the men of the times during which these documents were written, a truth that entered into the very center of the Catholic dogmatic message and which they had never seen seriously contradicted. So unquestionable did this truth appear to the men of Christian civilization that the very heretics who broke away from and launched themselves against the Catholic communion never dreamed of denying the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation. The teaching occurs in the heresiarch Calvin's *Institutio christianae religionis*[10] and in several Protestant statements of belief. Among these latter are the Belgic Confession of 1561,[11] the Scotch Confession of 1560,[12] the Irish Articles of Religion of 1615,[13] and the Westminster Confession of 1647.[14] The last-named document, incidentally, speaks of the *visible* Church as something outside of which there is ordinarily no salvation. This manner of speaking was and remains quite in harmony with the peculiar ecclesiology manifest in the Westminster Confession, although it is quite inadequate as an expression of the divinely revealed truth about the true Church of Jesus Christ.

During the nineteenth century, however, the traditional Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church had become obscured or confused in some Catholic circles. Hence Pope Pius IX found it necessary to insist upon this dogma and to take measures to overcome the misunderstanding generated by a somewhat naive "Catholic liberalism." His most extensive treatment of the dogma on the Church's necessity is to be found

---

LXXI. The second sentence in the citation from the Council expresses one of the central truths in the ecclesiology of St. Augustine. Cf. *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, Lib. 4, cap. 24; *Sermo ad Caesareensis Ecclesiae plebem* n. 6; *Epist. CXLI*, n. 5.

[10] Cf. Book IV, chapter 1, n. 4. In Tholuck's edition (Edinburgh, 1874), II, 230.

[11] Cf. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), III, 418.

[12] Cf. *ibid.*, III, 458.

[13] Cf. *ibid.*, III, 538.

[14] Cf. *ibid.*, III, 657.

in his Allocution, the *Singulari quadam*, pronounced on Dec. 9, 1854.

In this Allocution the Holy Father dealt with two distinct errors then troubling the minds of European Catholics. Having completed his teaching on rationalism, the first of these errors, he proceeded to deal with the other.

> Not without sorrow have we seen that another error, and one not less ruinous, has taken possession of certain portions of the Catholic world, and has entered into the souls of the many Catholics who think that they can well hope for the eternal salvation of all those who have in no way entered into the true Church of Christ. For that reason they are wont to inquire time and time again as to what is going to be the fate and the condition after death of those who have never yielded themselves to the Catholic faith and, convinced by completely inadequate arguments, they expect a response that will favor this evil teaching. Far be it from Us, Venerable Brethren, to presume to establish limits to the divine mercy, which is infinite. Far be it from us to wish to scrutinize the hidden counsels and judgments of God, which are "a great deep," and which human thought can never penetrate. In accordance with our apostolic duty, we desire to stir up your episcopal solicitude and vigilance to drive out of the mind of men, to the extent to which you are able to use all of your energies, that equally impious and deadly opinion that the way of eternal salvation can certainly be found in any religion. With all the skill and learning at your command, you should prove to the people committed to your care that this dogma of Catholic faith is in no way opposed to the divine mercy and justice.[15]

The basic approach of Pope Pius IX to the dogma of the Church's necessity was such as to show very clearly that the great Pontiff regarded this particular truth as one about which the faithful should be particularly well informed. The contradiction, or even the weakening of this dogma must be regarded as an evil which the Bishops of the Catholic Church are bound to oppose with all the intellectual forces at their disposal. And, we must remember that the Holy Father was not dealing with any crass denial of the axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*" He was faced with a situation in which it was taken for granted that non-Catholics would be saved through the use of those spiritual resources available to them as non-members of the Church of Christ, apart from any real acceptance of the Catholic faith or of the Catholic Church. It was precisely this attitude or opinion which Pius IX characterized as impious and deadly.

---

[15] *DB*, 1646.

The *Singulari quadam* then goes on to give the fundamental explanation of that teaching which the Holy Father had commanded the Catholic Bishops to expound to their own flocks. They had been told to show those over whom they were placed that the Catholic dogma on the necessity of the Church for salvation was in no way opposed to the truths about the divine justice and mercy. They were to proceed in this fashion.

> Certainly we must hold it as of faith that no one can be saved outside of the apostolic Roman Church, that this is the only Ark of Salvation, that the one who does not enter this is going to perish in the deluge. But nevertheless we must likewise hold it as certain that those who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if that [ignorance] be invincible, will never be charged with any guilt on this account before the eyes of the Lord. Now who is there who would arrogate to himself the power to point out the extent of such ignorance according to the nature and the variety of peoples, regions, talents and so many other things? For really when, loosed from these bodily bonds, we see God as He is, we shall certainly understand with what intimate and beautiful a bond the divine mercy and justice are joined together. But, while we live on earth, weighed down by this mortal body that darkens the mind, let us hold most firmly out of Catholic doctrine that there is one God, one faith, one baptism. It is wicked to go on inquiring beyond this.[16]

In this allocution the statement that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church is presented definitely as a matter of divine faith, as one of those truths which God has revealed to the world through Jesus Christ and which Our Lord teaches infallibly within the company of His disciples. Hence any attempt at explanation of this teaching which involves exceptions to or a denial of this absolute truth must be rejected as contrary to the divine teaching itself. Thus the statements which follow upon this basic pronouncement in the *Singulari quadam* definitely must not be interpreted as involving anything like a weakening of the dogma itself.

The second statement in the foregoing paragraph, the one to the effect that invincible ignorance of the true religion will not be accounted as an offense by God, was requisite for a proper explanation of the dogma in the time of Pope Pius IX, and it remains no less necessary in our own day. Acting upon a distinctively Protestant notion of God's kingdom on earth, some of the enemies of the Catholic Church had misinterpreted the dogma of the Church's necessity to mean that men would be considered blameworthy for invincible ignorance of the true Church. Such, of course, is not the true and traditional meaning of this dogma. Unfortunately, however, a certain number of Catholics had been uncritical enough to imagine that a straightforward explanation of this dogma would involve the blasphemous doctrine that men are blameworthy precisely by reason of their invincible ignorance. Pope Pius IX demanded that the Bishops of the Catholic Church exert themselves to drive this deadly misconception from the minds of their subjects. He attacked it, consequently, in his own Allocution.

---

[16] *DB*, 1647.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that the possibility and existence of a genuine invincible ignorance about the true Church of God has nothing whatsoever to do with the Church's real necessity of means for eternal salvation. If the Church were requisite merely in terms of the necessity of precept, then the existence of a really inculpable ignorance with reference to it would automatically excuse all of those held in the ties of that ignorance. But it so happens that the Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means. Hence, those who have hitherto remained in ignorance of the true Church through no fault of their own still need this society in order to attain to the Beatific Vision.

In order to understand this portion of the *Singulari quadam* it is absolutely essential to keep in mind the truth which forms the essential background to all of the Catholic teaching about the necessity of the Church for salvation, the divinely revealed doctrine that the salvation of mankind is something intrinsically supernatural and something of which the family of Adam is rightly deprived because of original sin. For this twofold reason, then, eternal salvation must not be considered as something naturally *due* to man. Salvation, as the term itself indicates, implies a transfer from an undesirable status to a condition of blessedness. Concretely, the salvation of any human being involves a transfer from the fallen family of Adam to that company which is known as the Body of Jesus Christ.

The man who is not thus brought or transferred into the Body of Jesus Christ, but who remains merely a member of the fallen family of Adam, will not attain to the Beatific Vision. Even though such a man has had no means of knowing the existence of the true Church of Jesus Christ, and consequently is in no way to blame for not entering this society or not even desiring to enter it, he will still remain deprived of the Beatific Vision if he departs from this life in such a condition. The mortal sins which he may have committed in this life, together with original sin itself, would suffice to constitute him as unworthy of heaven. The fact that he had not been incorporated into the one supernatural society within which the divine fellowship is to be found in this world would render him ineligible for the essentially supernatural beatitude of the Church triumphant.

As the *Singulari quadam* reminds us quite forcibly, it remains true that no one can judge accurately about the extent and the location of truly invincible ignorance with reference to the true Church of Christ in this world. Thus, to state the matter concretely, it is quite impossible for us to say whether or not some individual Protestant, living in a region where the Catholic Church flourishes, is invincibly ignorant of that Church by reason of his upbringing and his prejudices. As a matter of fact, such a judgement does not fall within our competence as preachers of Catholic truth. Actually we are and we remain the ambassadors of Christ, charged with the entirety of that message, but only with that message, which Jesus Christ teaches within our communion. The truth that the Catholic Church is actually requisite for eternal salvation forms an integral part of that message. The truth about the culpability or the lack of it in any outsider's ignorance of the true Church is definitely not a part of the teaching with which we are entrusted. Consequently, as Pope Pius IX warns us, we are only abusing our commission when we attempt to form a judgment on such matters.

Actually the truth which God has in fact revealed on the subject of the Church's necessity for salvation clearly implies the tremendous need for genuine apostolic activity on the part of all Catholics and especially on the part of priests. It is the will of God that no man should be lost or deprived of eternal salvation. Yet, in the providence of God, no man will be saved outside of the Body of Christ which is the Catholic Church. It is within our power to bring the Church and its divine message to the peoples of the earth. Hence, if we should be lax in our apostolic endeavors, we must be considered as recreant in our love for and gratitude to Christ.

As a matter of fact the lax or "liberal" interpretation of the dogma concerning the Church's necessity for salvation is essentially a screen for a tepid or non-existent missionary spirit. If the way of salvation were really open to men in all religions or in all religious societies, then there would certainly be no valid reason for pouring out the best blood of the Catholic Church in the never-ending effort to plant the company of Christ among the peoples of the world. The missionary labors of the Catholic Church are expended, not to bring about a mere improvement in the condition of people who would have been in a position to be saved in any event, but actually to carry the message and the means of salvation to those who sit in darkness. The work of converting men to the Church of Christ aims not at bringing an easier way of salvation but at bringing the very hope of salvation to the beneficiaries of Catholic preaching.

Those in whom God has implanted a sincere desire and prayer for the means of salvation will receive them: but they will receive them from the Church itself. Hence it is the duty of all those who have been favored by God with membership in the Church to do whatever is in their power to forward the apostolic work of Christ. Such is the teaching of the *Singulari quadam*.

> For the rest, as the cause of charity demands, let us pour out continual prayers to God that all nations everywhere may be converted to Christ. And let us do all in our power to bring about the common salvation of men, for the hand of the Lord is not shortened and the gifts of heavenly grace will never be lacking to those who sincerely wish and pray to be comforted in this light. Truths of this kind must be most deeply implanted in the minds of the faithful so that they may not be corrupted by the false doctrines which tend to encourage the indifference of religion which we see slowly being spread abroad and strengthened to the ruin of souls.[17]

Any doctrine which, even under the pretense of explaining the axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," actually presents the Catholic Church as an agency not really requisite for salvation is rightly designated by the *Singulari quadam* as fostering or inculcating religious indifferentism. For it is by no means characteristic of this indifferentism to say that one religion is as good as another. What is essential to it is the mistaken notion that man can achieve his ultimate end outside of and apart from the true Church of Jesus Christ.

---

[17] *DB*, 1648.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the March, 1898, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* the leading article, entitled "Gethsemane," is by Dr. Alfred Loisy. It is a commentary on the biblical account of our Lord's agony in the Garden. [There seems to be nothing in the article indicative of a lack of orthodoxy, though biblical experts might perceive a tendency toward the views which later rendered the unfortunate author one of the leaders of Modernism]. . . . Writing under the heading "What shall be his Name?" Fr. William Stang explains the law of the Church requiring a Christian name to be conferred in baptism. He points out, however, that sometimes a name is presented which at first sight may not appear to be that of a saint, though in reality it is a modified form of some saint's name, and adds a list of approved names with varied forms in which they may appear. Thus, Elsie is a form of Adelaide, Brian of Bernard, Pierce of Peter. . . . Against three communications to the contrary, H.J.H. defends his view that children who die without baptism may subsequently, in virtue of prayers offered for them, be given the grace to elicit the requisite acts for admission to eternal happiness. . . . The *Analecta* section contains the apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII approving the constitutions of the Sisters of St. Joseph in the United States. . . . In the answer to one of the theological questions the view is expressed that baptism can be conferred if one person pours the water while another says the words, as long as the former is acting at the command of the latter. In this event, the writer asserts, the action of the one pouring the water is a mechanical act, directed, not by his own, but by the other's intention. [I doubt if this view would find favor with many theologians]. . . . Professor Prinzivalli writes from Rome of the discovery, in the old palace of Tiberius on the Palatine Hill, of a mural engraving of our Lord on the cross, with the name "Chrestus" written over his head. The Professor believes that the engraving was the work of a pagan soldier who had served in Jerusalem and who may have been present at the Crucifixion.

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

INTERRUPTION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE

Question: One evening lately I had anticipated two Nocturns of the following day's Office, but circumstances rendered it impossible for me to say any more that night. In view of the teaching of moralists that only a three hours' interval is permitted between Nocturns, was I obliged to recite these two Nocturns again the following day?

Answer: The three hours' interval which moralists say is permissible between Nocturns refers to the merely *lawful*, not the *valid* fulfilment of the obligation of the Office. Furthermore, this ruling does not bind *sub gravi*—in other words, if a priest, without any reasonable cause separated the Nocturns by more than three hours, he would commit a venial, not a mortal sin. And, even in this event, he would not be bound to recite again the Nocturn or Nocturns already recited. For, once a portion of the Office has been duly recited within the time permitted for the fulfillment of this obligation, there is no obligation to repeat it, however long a period may elapse before the breviary is again taken up.

Furthermore, if the priest has a sufficient reason for stopping after the second Nocturn and leaving the third until the following day, he is guilty of no sin whatsoever. The sufficient reason need not be a grave reason—it may be any utility to oneself or to some one else. Thus, a sufficient reason to interrupt the Office after the second Nocturn until the next day would be present if the priest were summoned to some task of the sacred ministry, and felt somewhat fatigued on his return, if a brother priest dropped in and he wished to show him due hospitality, if he were unexpectedly asked to prepare a special sermon for the following day, etc. From this it will be evident that the questioner not only was not bound to recite the first two Nocturns again, but that he was guilty of no fault at all in deferring the recitation of the third Nocturn until the following day, since it was impossible for him to say any more that night. (Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1944], I, n. 1123.)

HOW SOON MAY EMBALMING BEGIN?

Question: In view of the modern opinion that apparent death may precede real death by a considerable period of time, what admonitions should be given to our people, particularly to Catholic undertakers, as to how soon the process of embalming can be started after a person has apparently breathed his last?

Answer: This is a problem of great importance in the United States, where the embalming of the dead is a general practice. The main principle is this: the process of embalming may not be commenced until it is certain that life is extinct. For, undoubtedly, if the person is still alive, the embalming process will directly cause death. Furthermore, mere probability—even very great probability—that death has ensued will not justify the beginning of this process; for it is not permissible to do anything which even only probably will directly cause the death of an innocent person (Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1944], I, n. 100).

It would seem best to have the testimony of a good doctor to the effect that the person is certainly dead before the undertaker is allowed to begin the process of embalming. But frequently it is not possible to obtain such testimony; and even when it is procured, a period of time should elapse between the apparent moment of death and the beginning of the process. What would be a safe norm as to the length of this period? It would seem that when a person has died after a long and wasting illness, embalming may not be commenced until one full hour after all signs of life have ceased. But in the case of one who has died suddenly after enjoying at least moderately good health—e.g., from drowning, strangulation, electrocution, heart failure, apoplexy—three hours should be allowed to pass before the undertaker makes an incision on the body (Cf. McFadden, *Medical Ethics for Nurses* [Philadelphia, 1946], 321). Catholic undertakers should be instructed to this effect, and when the priest is attending a person who is soon to die it would be appropriate to give similar instructions to the members of the family.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C. SS. R.

REMOVING THE MANIPLE FOR THE SERMON

Question: Is the custom of removing the maniple during the sermon a rubric or merely a *pia consuetudo*? I preach at the two Masses which I celebrate every Sunday but I never take off the maniple before ascending the pulpit. I have been told that it is obligatory to remove the maniple but I have not been able to find any reference to it in the rubrics of the Mass.

Answer: It is true that the maniple is strictly a vestment to be worn only at Mass. All the other vestments are worn also on other occasions. Thus, the alb with amice and cincture is worn for Solemn Benediction. The stole is worn for the administration of the Sacraments. Even the chasuble may be worn by non-officiating priests in a procession like that of Corpus Christi. But the use of the maniple is restricted to Mass; hence it is removed even for functions which are associated with Mass like the blessing of the candles, ashes, and palms and the absolution of the body which follows a funeral Mass.

The question arises as to whether the sermon, when preached by the celebrant, is to be regarded as something distinct from the Mass. Historically, it cannot be so regarded. Our earliest description of the liturgy, that of the First Apology of St. Justin Martyr, dating from about the year 160, tells how the presiding priest, as part of the ceremony, delivers a commentary on the Scripture just read. The *Caeremoniale episcoporum* (*Lib.* II, *Cap.* viii, 48) directs the mode of procedure to be followed when the celebrating bishop preaches at Pontifical Mass but says nothing to indicate that he should remove the maniple. Our conclusion is that the sermon is intimately connected with the Mass itself so that, if it is delivered by the celebrant, he retains all the vestments, including the maniple.

POSITION OF THE FINGERS IN IMPARTING BLESSINGS

Question: In various statues, for example, in that of the Christ-Child, we see the right hand held up in blessing in such a way that the thumb and the two first fingers are extended but the other two are folded in against the palm of the hand. The symbolism seems to be of the Blessed Trinity and of the two natures in the incarnate Son of God. The question arises, who here on earth has the right to hold his fingers in this position when giving a blessing? Is it correct to say that this is restricted to the Holy Father and, in Christian art, to pictures of our Lord?

Answer: The original sign of the cross seems to have been made with the thumb or the forefinger. The larger sign of the cross employing the entire hand is of later introduction. This latter arose in the East, the thumb and two fingers being extended to symbolize the Blessed Trinity and the ring and little fingers being folded back on the palm to denote the two natures, or the two wills, in the God-made-Man. This method of holding the fingers, with some slight variations, is still employed in tracing the sign of the cross in the Eastern Rites. The Roman Rite to-day, however, prescribes that all the fingers be held extended as the hand is moved in the action of blessing. Such is the direction of the Missal (*Ritus servandus*, III, 5).

The Holy Father has retained the older method of disposing his fingers in imparting blessings, that is, with thumb and first two fingers displayed and the last two folded against the palm of the hand. We should think that, in Christian art, this disposition of the fingers should be reserved to images of our Lord in the act of blessing or pictures of saints who were Sovereign Pontiffs or of an Oriental rite. We may remark that the Infant of Prague is represented as holding his fingers in this Papal gesture as the right hand is raised in blessing.

William J. Lallou

The Church and Materialistic Philosophy

Because the Church is by divine institution the sole depository and interpreter of the ideals and teachings of Christ, she alone possesses in any complete and true sense the power effectively to combat that materialistic philosophy which has already done and still threatens such tremendous harm to the home and to the state. The Church alone can introduce into society and maintain therein the prestige of a true, sound spiritualism, the spiritualism of Christianity which both from the point of view of truth and of its practical value is quite superior to any exclusively philosophical theory.

Pope Pius XI, in *Ubi arcano* (The Encyclicals of Pius XI [St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1927], pp. 28 f.).

Book Reviews

American Essays for the Newman Centennial. Edited by John K. Ryan and Edmond Darvil Benard. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xiii + 244. $3.50.

This is a collection of thirteen essays on different phases of the life, personality, and work of John Henry Cardinal Newman. During the centennial year of the Cardinal's conversion they were originally presented in the pages of various American Catholic periodicals. The present volume is a skillful selection of the best of such American essays and, under the aegis of Msgr. Ryan's stimulating and graceful introduction, it should remain an enduring monument to a figure who has influenced so profoundly and deserved so well of English-speaking Catholicism on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

Seldom does a single book offer such a compellingly interesting example of "unity amid variety." So diverse are the subjects which constitute the several essay themes that their unity would be only that of many wholly disparate gems strung upon a single cord, were it not that their common ground is the living unity of the great Cardinal's fascinating, complex personality. That their variety is so striking is but one more tribute to the breadth of Newman's brilliant gifts of heart and mind and pen.

"Most Consoling Intelligence From England" is the first of the three historical essays which open the collection. Drawing liberally from columns of the Catholic press of a century ago, it describes how the first news of Newman's conversion came to America and its narrative carries anew all the excitement and suspense and holy pride which accompanied those first reports. The second essay sums up the subsequent spiritual harvest in the United States, stemming so largely from the impact of that intelligence upon the Protestant mind in our country. Some hitherto unpublished letters of the Cardinal are the substance of the third essay. They were written to members of the American hierarchy and are new windows into the exquisite courage and luminous gratitude which made the Cardinal so loveable a person.

The reader who is intrigued by the mysterious soul processes which are studied in the theological treaties *De actu fidei* and whose culmination is adult conversion will find "The Psychology of a Conversion" an essay which he cannot easily put down unfinished. This fourth essay turns the direction of the reader's gaze into the thrilling panorama of Newman's own interior life of clear thinking, delicate feeling, and truly apostolic charity. From this point the essays treat of the great Cardinal as apostle and poet, as preacher and moulder of lasting prose, as educator and as theologian.

It is worthy of note that the three essays which deal with what was Newman's greatest single gift to the work of the Church after his conversion, his achievement for the cause of true education, are in themselves real contributions to that cause. One feels, when reading them, that the great man whom they honor will be more gratified by this careful and original thinking which his own work still inspires than by any other tribute within these many appreciative pages.

Longest and in one sense most useful chapter of the present book is the careful appraisal of Newman's ideas on Papal Infallibility, written by Doctor Fenton. It would be strange if, in the case of a mind which ranged as widely and fearlessly as did Newman's, some instances of inaccurate conclusions were not to be found. "Newman and Papal Infallibility" does a real service to those who so profoundly and so justly revere the convert Cardinal's sensitive theological judgment when it points out that, in this point of doctrine, beset with additional complexities by the circumstances of Newman's times, his analysis of the subject left much to be desired. But a splendid portrait can glow the more for a touch of shadow. And the grandeur of Newman would seem to shine out the more for this reminder that he, like us, could fail of perfection.

An extensive bibliography of Newman centennial literature closes a volume which does honor to those who wrought it, to the princely mind and heart of him in tribute to whom it was fashioned, and to the Family of God on earth which holds the children He gives to it in such long and loving memory.

JOSEPH BLUETT, S.J.

ARCHBISHOP STEPINAC, THE MAN AND HIS CASE. By Anthony Henry Count O'Brien of Thomand. Wesminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1947. Pp. 100. $1.75.

An article in the *Washington Post* of Dec. 13, 1947, stated that the United Nations Commission of Human Rights, meeting in Geneva, had rejected the Soviet proposal to make racial and religious discrimination and propaganda inciting "national hatred," crimes of war. It was another of those veiled proposals on the part of the Soviet which would bring about international acceptance of what has already been done wherever the Hammer and Sickle fling their shadows. Lord Dukeston of the United Kingdom summed up the arguments of those who were opposed to this proposal with the following statement, "in plain language the Soviet proposal meant that a one-party government could discriminate against those with different political convictions because there were no provisions for the protection of political opinions." Add to those unprotected, those who differ, morally and religiously, with a one-party government, and you will have what has really happened already, as admirably described by the author of *Archbishop Stepinac, The Man and His Case.*

Count O'Brien, with a thorough knowledge of Yugoslavia and its difficulties, (covering those periods of the Nazi invasion, the quisling domination and the usurpation by Tito's forces), a close intimacy with the martyr-Archbishop, and rare legal talent, is an authority in the field in which he writes. This book should therefore merit at least as much consideration as the statements of those who have visited Yugoslavia in a personally conducted tour.

Count O'Brien has presented the Archbishop's case and can rest his argument before the bar of unprejudiced minds. His brief contains the background of the Archbishop in the light of what he as a personal observer has witnessed. He describes the activity of the Archbishop during the quisling regime, so that by the time his trial takes place the only interest that remains for the reader is how Tito's prosecutors will twist and distort what has been factually presented. The author shows how this is done and with his legal insight points out two damaging points which clearly show how the trial became a travesty on Justice. The author quotes from a statement of the Public Prosecutor before the trial. "When the investigations are complete I shall indict him of offense against the people and the state." As the author points out, this is what we would call, in our land, conviction before trial. The second point brought out by the author, and one which should make all justice loving men shudder, is that the Archbishop was tried for specific "crimes" committed before the laws governing those "crimes" were passed.

A few statistics given by the author grimly reveal "freedom of religion" under Tito and make the reader wonder where our American clergymen spent their time on their visit to Titoslavia. In 1939 there were 1916 Catholic priests in Yugoslavia; in 1946 the number had been reduced to 401. Four hundred thousand Catholic lay people have been killed.

Count O'Brien has portrayed Archbishop Stepinac for what he is, the personification in our age, of justice as opposed to injustice, the man of God opposed to the forces of anti-God. Bishop Hurley of Saint Augustine, who attended the "trial" of Archbishop Stepinac, is quoted in this book as saying of the Archbishop, he is "the Mercier of our time."

May this book have many readers in our land where there are too many who are not above accepting distorted facts. And may there be many voices raised in the prayer of the author appearing in the preface. "May Our Lady of Marija Bistritza, the patroness of Croatia, whose devoted son and zealous servant Monsignor Stepinac has been all his life, guide this book on its way, so that it may achieve its aim; to make its readers realize and raise their voices against the crime committed by the enemies of Christ and His church in depriving Monsignor Stepinac of his personal freedom and impeding his labors for God and the people of Croatia."

JOHN J. REILLY

RETREAT FOR PRIESTS. By Ronald Knox. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946. Pp. 186. $2.00.

A retreat for priests, like a mission for the people, is a series of concentrated discourses on the basic truths of Christianity and salvation. As the name indicates, it is conducted under circumstances of withdrawal from normal daily business, so that full attention may be given to meditation and prayer. During this period, the individual is subjected to a sort of general spiritual house-cleaning. At the end of the retreat, he should see time and eternity in better perspective; he should have drawn up some practical resolutions for the better guidance of his life, and he should be inspired to a more active participation in divine grace.

Needless to say, the bald repetition of fundamental principles, however important they may be, can become exceedingly dull, particularly to those who have already accepted them. Something more is needed, in the way of imaginative treatment, with judicious handling of observation and experience, to make a congregation, even of priests with the very best will, stay awake and relish the experience. Moreover, the trend of exposition must be positive, detailed, and fitted into the real dilemmas of life, if the retreat is to perform the function of "purging out the old leaven" and of guiding one's life and mission along the true lines of Christ.

In this "retreat for priests," designed specifically for the English clergy but applicable to all, Monsignor Knox has produced an excellent series of conferences which are at once basic and lively. They are broad in concept yet sufficiently detailed for the average parish priest, or religious, to recognize personal pitfalls and to grasp the means of advancing over and around them to achieve, with God's help, the supernatural mission which has been assigned to him.

Eighteen chapters, or conferences, comprise the volume. The starting point, or what the Jesuits call the "composition of place," for each is a story from the Old Testament, from Creation, which serves to exalt the special character of priestly ordination, through the calling of Moses to the high mountain, which serves to bring the retreat to a close. Under various types and characters drawn from the history of the Jews, pertinent applications are made for the priest in such matters as the use of creatures, sin, the Incarnation, the Passion, worldliness, the Holy Eucharist, death, the need of vigilance, the dignity of the priesthood, reprobation, the divine office, the value of gentleness, prayer, grace, and devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Although not immediately obvious, there is a logical progression from principles to applications, and from the spiritually purgative to the illuminative, following the career and teaching of Christ into the development of the priestly life.

The general theme of the book seems to be this: "You have a double responsibility; as man, it is your duty to make conscious response of love and gratitude towards God on behalf of His creation; as priest, it is your duty to make that response the first claim on your life." With reference to the use of creatures, he repeats the counsel of Richard of St. Victor: *"Accipe, redde, time;* accept them, return thanks for them, be frightened of them."

In the opinion of this reviewer, however, it is unfortunate that a familiar but curious distinction is drawn between human activity and that which is spiritual. Thus, for example, "Our friendships, harmless but not necessary friendships; the company of our fellowmen; the amenities of life, our enjoyment, for example, of scenery or music; our amusements—yes, we need *some,* but are they all quite necessary?—our self-cultivation (reading, for example); they are all extras, aren't they?" Such activities, he seems to think, cut down on time that one should give to God. Perhaps we need a better definition of what is meant by giving time to God or of the value of such activities, recalling the priest who stated that he read books "to *kill* time."

Somewhat the same inference, in need of further clarification, is found in his view of "those Christians who want to make the best of both worlds; who are prepared to risk Purgatory, and all that it may have in store for them, and are determined to enjoy to the full, while they may, the more easily attained comforts of earth." Basic orientations are here involved, which must be honestly and thoroughly studied, if the Catholic priest is to live and teach a philosophy of life in conformity with legitimate human desires and the will of God.

These observations are incidental to the book as a whole, which may be enthusiastically recommended to priests as substantial spiritual reading and as material for conferences of their own.

James A. Magner

THE HEART AFLAME. By the Rt. Rev. Hugh F. Blunt, LL.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. ix + 127. $2.50.

Although the author has sub-titled this book "Thoughts on Devotion to the Sacred Heart," we hasten to note that it is not a book of devotions. Nor are the thoughts recorded herein intended to be exhaustive of the theme which has been so extensively treated by others. The purpose of the present addition to the already available mass of literature on the subject is, as gleaned from the foreword, rather to emphasize the current importance of this devotion than to explain it in full detail. Nevertheless, one finds in this small volume a wealth of summary exposition of the topic from the historical, theological, and devotional aspects of its development. The tone of the whole is somewhat apologetical inasmuch as it aims to set forth the solid doctrinal basis for the devotion; and it is also somewhat apocalyptic in the sense that it argues persuasively for the greater practice of the devotion amid the portents of our times.

Historically, the devotion is shown to have been implicitly contained in even the earliest Christian approach to the God of Love manifest in the hypostatic union. Its gradual particularization is traced in outline by reference to the personal "high lights" in its growth from private to public use and approval. The author employs a literary parallel to the life of Christ in this presentation, describing "the prophets" in the time of St. Gertrude, "the forerunner" as St. John Eudes, and St. Margaret Mary as "the apostle."

A separate chapter on the theology of the devotion succinctly expounds its doctrinal nature, its orthodox consistency and the consequences of its final approval for universal use as we now have it. The specific purpose of the devotion, "reparation," is stressed as being of the greatest moment for modern man and the catastrophic world in which he lives. Decrying the lack of this spirit among men at large, including those externally attached to the devotion, the author concludes with an appeal for the more fervent fostering of its essentials, its more widespread adoption by the faithful, and especially its most timely propagation by every priest. Both its content and its format will make Msgr. Blunt's latest contribution to religious science effective spiritual reading.

GERALD A. RYAN

BALTIMORE CATECHISM WITH DEVELOPMENT. By Most Rev. Edward J. Kelly, D.D. Boise, Idaho: The Chancery Office, 1946. Pp. x + 294.

This is the third of a three-volume series of developed lesson plans in religion by the Most Reverend Edward J. Kelly, Bishop of Boise. The present book is planned primarily for the third and intermediate grades.

Volume three (grades V-VI) and the fourth volume (grades VII-VIII) have already been in use since 1945 and have proved their worth. In the present text the entire Baltimore Catechism is covered in one hundred lessons including properly spaced reviews. Here, as with the other volumes of this series, the catechetical method of St. Augustine is followed and a practical application for the pupils is suggested in each lesson. The doctrinal explanation of the catechism is clear and sufficiently complete to correlate with the age level of the children. Colored engravings are employed in most of the lessons which greatly increase the attractiveness of the pages and contribute added interest to the reader. Bishop Kelly has written a preface for the teacher that contains practical directions for handling the text and suggestions for supplementary reading on the part of the pupils.

There is a growing tendency to place fully developed lesson plans in the hands of the catechist who has had little or no formal training in the content and methodology of the religion class. No longer is it permitted to give a catechism to the well-intentioned individual and let him or her take over the class. Lesson plans supply a practical need and hence their use is always recommended, even for the experienced teacher who will employ them as a guide to carry out the course of study. We need more and better trained teachers of religion today—teachers who have completed courses in content and method commensurate with the importance and pedagogical difficulty of the religion course. Bishop Kelly's texts mark a distinct and important step in this direction and they will doubtless find ready and full acceptance beyond the diocese for which they were planned.

JOSEPH B. COLLINS, S.S.

HOLY WEEK IN LARGE AND SMALL CHURCHES. By Rev. Laurence J. O'Connell. Milwaukee: the Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. xviii + 332. $3.75.

The present volume is the complement to the author's *The Book of Ceremonies,* giving the directions for the conduct of the functions of Holy Week, both in their solemn form, with the assistance of deacon and subdeacon, and in their simpler execution with a priest celebrant and lay acolytes. The period covered is, as usual, Palm Sunday and the last three days of Holy Week.

For each day there is a general conspectus of the ceremonies, called by the author a "Preview," which is followed by detailed directions for the officiant, each of the sacred ministers, and each of the minor ministers. The merit of the arrangement is that each participant can study his own part in full without reference to those of the others. All the directions, including the explanatory foot-notes, are repeated